

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JULY 29, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

A RATHER BOLD STEP in the direction of fusion has been taken by the arrangement which has been made that Mr. Justice Field shall be the equity vacation judge. The learned judge will have the assistance of the chamber staff of Vice-Chancellor Malins. The other vacation judge will be Mr. Baron Huddleston.

WE UNDERSTAND that the committee consisting of members of the various circuits, which was recently appointed to consider the question of special retainers, has come to the conclusion that the special retaining fee for a junior who accepts a brief on a foreign circuit should remain at fifty guineas, as at present, and that the special retaining fee for a Queen's Counsel should be reduced from 300 guineas to 100 guineas.

THE VERY UNDIGNIFIED QUARREL with reference to trying issues sent from the Chancery Division—a dispute more worthy of the servants' hall than the judicial bench—has this week passed into a new phase. The Lord Chief Justice at Hertford announced that Mr. Baron Huddleston, acting with his concurrence, meant "to take the opinion of the judges in town as to whether it is competent to the equity judges thus to send *issues of fact* to be tried by the judges of the common law divisions." As we pointed out last week, section 29 of the Judicature Act, 1873, and ord. 36, r. 29, leave not the smallest possibility of doubt on this matter; and we cannot think that the answer which the learned baron will receive from his brethren will be satisfactory to himself. It is, indeed, obvious that uncomfortable doubts have afflicted the Lord Chief Justice himself; for on Saturday he returned to the subject and took new ground, apparently admitting that power was given to the equity judges to "direct a local trial by jury," but maintaining that this power ought not to be exercised for the convenience of the court, but "with reference to the convenience of the cause." We quite agree; but then the obvious question arises, Who is to exercise this discretion—the judge who sends the case for trial, or the judge who is to try it? The rules plainly say the former. Ord. 36, r. 29, provides that "in any cause the court, or a judge of the division to which the cause is assigned, may at any time . . . order the trial and determination of any question or issue of fact, or partly of fact and partly of law, by any commissioner or commissioners [of assize] appointed in pursuance of the 29th section of the Act, . . . and such question or issue shall be tried and determined accordingly." The judge who has to try the case has no option; when once the order is made by the judge of the division to which the cause is attached, he is bound to try it. This being so, all the considerations of convenience on which the Lord Chief Justice has harped so much are utterly irrelevant. They may be good reasons

for an alteration of the law; they furnish no excuse whatever for disobeying it. According to the Attorney-General, the remedy for these unseemly disputes is to be found in new rules of court to be made by the parties to the quarrel. This seems to afford a strong argument in favour of taking out of the hands of the body of the judges the power of legislation conferred upon them by the Judicature Acts. Questions of practice and procedure affecting the duties of the judges of the common law divisions or of the Chancery Division are certain to arise from time to time with reference to which rules of court ought to be framed. The chancery judges may be of opinion that the interests of the public would be best served by some change involving an addition to the labours of the judges of the common law divisions. The profession and the public may be of the same opinion. But while the chancery judges, including the Chancellor and the ordinary judges of the Court of Appeal, are only eight in number, there are eighteen judges of the common law divisions. If the latter display the spirit shown by two of their number in the recent case, and by Lord Coleridge in his speech in the House of Lords on Thursday evening, the question would hardly receive impartial consideration.

THE REPORT of the Select Committee of both Houses on the Admission and Practice of Parliamentary Agents has appeared, and we regret to find that the committee are "not prepared to recommend that barristers and solicitors should be exclusively eligible to become parliamentary agents." The ground on which they base this opinion is that the training of barristers or solicitors does not afford in itself proof of *special* qualification. No one supposed that it did; but what was urged by Mr. Bircham before the committee, on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, was that, besides special qualifications, it was most important for the parliamentary agent to have some knowledge of the general principles of law such as is secured by the examinations to which barristers and solicitors are subjected. The necessary special knowledge could be acquired by the intending parliamentary agent in the same way as other special knowledge is acquired by persons intending to practise in any one of the numerous branches into which the profession of solicitor is now sub-divided. The person who intended to practise as a parliamentary agent, after being articled in the first instance to some general practitioner to acquire general legal knowledge, would have himself assigned for some part of his articles to a solicitor who was a parliamentary agent. Mr. Theodore Martin, C.B., who represented the Parliamentary Agents' Society, admitted to the committee that there should be some security that the parliamentary agent knows the general principles of law. Surely no better mode could be devised than to require that before he becomes such he shall have passed through, at all events, some part of the ordinary training required for the legal profession? That no violent change would be produced by such a rule is shown by the fact that, out of the sixty parliamentary agents promoting private Bills in the present session, fifty are believed to be, or to have been, solicitors or writers to the signet, three are barristers, and only seven do not belong to any of these classes. Besides securing the advantage of a legal education, the restriction proposed would insure an effective control over the agents, so as to obtain the punishment of misconduct. The committee seem to have been impressed with the importance of these objects; but instead of using machinery ready to hand, they wish to create new machinery. They propose that the parliamentary agents shall be constituted into a distinct body, and that no person who is not a member of that body shall be allowed to practise before Parliament. Admission to the body is to be obtained by examination, to be

conducted by examiners named by the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker; and the same authorities are to be invested with power to strike agents off the roll for professional misconduct. We are glad to observe that the Lord Chancellor has protested against this proposal to create a new and exclusive class of professional persons, and we trust that before another session it may become apparent even to Lord Redesdale that a man is not likely to make a less efficient parliamentary agent because he is also a solicitor or barrister.

WHEN MR. RUSSELL GURNEY tells the House of Commons that the result of his great experience as a criminal judge is to show the rule which prevents prisoners, or their wives or husbands, from giving evidence ought to be altered; and further states that the result of his inquiries and observations in America is to convince him that no danger attends such alteration, no one can help feeling some diffidence in expressing an opinion in favour of the retention of our present system. Theoretically, no doubt, he is right. That the object of the investigation of criminal cases is the elucidation of truth, and that the rule which shuts the mouths of the persons who know most about the matter in hand often seriously hinders the attainment of this object, is an evil, we all agree; but the question in this case, as in most others, is one of a choice of evils. Assume that all innocent accused persons are wise and intelligent; that all private prosecutors are actuated simply by upright motives and by public spirit; that all prosecuting counsel are fair, and that all juries and all judges are, and ever will be, patient and equal-minded, and Mr. Russell Gurney's proposals would be unexceptionable. But can any one grant these assumptions? Would the private prosecutor who now refrains from charging an innocent man because he knows that there is a mere case of suspicion against him refrain from doing so if he knew that, when once the prisoner was brought before the court, he must either subject himself to cross-examination on oath or by his silence admit that he dare not speak? Would the prosecuting counsel refrain from taking advantage of his skill to entrap the stupid or ignorant prisoner into inaccurate statements, inconsistencies, and damaging revelations as to his character? Would the judge and the jury make an allowance for the bewilderment of a prisoner under such an ordeal as this? We think not. It is unfortunate that Mr. Russell Gurney in his admirable speech failed to grapple with these practical difficulties. Until they are removed we must decline to consider that a case is made out for the extension from civil to criminal cases of the rule as to evidence by the parties. There can be little question that under our present system the guilty sometimes go unpunished; that is an evil, no doubt. There can be still less doubt that the innocent are very seldom punished; that is a good which we humbly think goes far to counterbalance the evil.

AN IMPRESSION has prevailed that the Master of the Rolls, in *Taylor v. Taylor* (L. R. 1 Ch. D. 426), laid it down that an equitable tenant for life cannot present a petition under the Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act. The decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal on the 25th inst., but simply on the ground that, upon the construction of the particular will before them, the petitioner was not, within the meaning of section 16 of the Act, "a person entitled to the possession or the receipt of the rents and profits" of the settled estate, and the court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) expressed an opinion that the Master of the Rolls did not intend to lay down any such general doctrine as that which had been attributed to him.

THE PRINCIPLE OF REMOTENESS AS APPLIED TO DAMAGES TO REAL PROPERTY.

No more difficult cases arise than those in which the question is how far a defendant is responsible for the injuries consequent upon an act which, though not in itself directly unlawful—*i.e.*, unlawful apart from the consequences—and done without any negligence on the defendant's part, occasions, through the intervention of other combining causes, damage to others. We have on a previous occasion discussed the case of *Nichols v. Marsland* (23 W. R. 693, L. R. 10 Ex. 255). We wish to make a few further observations which have occurred to us on that case, because it seems to us that most important principles are involved in it, and that a correct analysis of the questions on which the decision depends would be of great service in solving many of the class of cases above alluded to.

In that case the defendant had formed an ornamental reservoir on her land, and, an unusually violent flood having taken place, the flood waters finding their way into the reservoir burst the dam at the foot of it, and damage was caused to the plaintiff's property. It was found by the jury that there was no negligence in the construction of the reservoir. The Court of Exchequer held that the defendant was not liable. It was argued for the plaintiff, on the authority of *Fletcher v. Rylands* (L. R. 3 H. L. 330), that a great mass of water was like a dangerous wild beast, and that he who altered the natural state of things and artificially brought together such a mass of water was bound at his peril to keep it in. The court, however, distinguished *Fletcher v. Rylands* on the following ground:—In *Fletcher v. Rylands* the defendant had formed a reservoir and brought water into it, and this water, by reason of faults in the earth beneath the bed of the reservoir, found its way into the plaintiff's mine. These faults were latent, and could not be known to the defendant, and neither he nor those whom he employed to make the reservoir were guilty of any negligence in the construction of it. At least the judgment seems to proceed on that basis, though Lord Cairns seems, in the House of Lords, to have been of opinion that there was negligence. The Court of Exchequer Chamber held that where a man brings a dangerous agent on to his land he must keep it in at his peril. In *Nichols v. Marsland*, on the other hand, it was not the water which the defendant had directly caused to be put in the reservoir which broke the dam and did the mischief, but water arising from an unusual and unexpected flood which, finding its way into the reservoir contrary to the defendant's intention and expectation, and being added to the weight of water which was there already, did the mischief. The court held as to this that the flood which occurred was so far extraordinary as fairly to be considered as the act of God, and, consequently, that the defendant could not be considered to be responsible for the damage occasioned by it. The court, moreover, did not assent to the analogy drawn between water and a wild beast, and they distinguished *Fletcher v. Rylands* on the ground that there the defendant poured the water into the plaintiff's mine, whereas, in the case before them, the defendant merely brought it to a place where another agent let it loose.

We cannot say that the state of the law on this subject is altogether satisfactory, or that the distinction thus drawn between the two cases is so explicit as might be desired. The distinction, as drawn by the court in *Nichols v. Marsland*, is capable of being interpreted as referring to the well-known distinction between trespass and case, and, at first sight, this may appear to be the distinction intended to be drawn. We confess to disliking this distinction as a means of solving such difficulties. It does not seem to us to correspond to any substantial moral distinction, and savours rather of the language of ancient pleading than of real justice. More-

over, we do not think that the authorities very distinctly show the exact line of demarcation between trespass and case. The original and primary notion of trespass is that of an intentional and unlawful act. The consequence may not be contemplated, and the illegality may be unknown for instance, as when A., lifting up his stick over his shoulder to hit B., hits C. unintentionally, and where a man, not exactly knowing the boundary of his own land, trespasses on another's land unwittingly. But in both these cases the act which, although not intended to do the mischief, did it, was intentional and unlawful. Upon this primary meaning of the word "trespass" a great deal of refinement has been created by the subtlety of ancient lawyers — as, for instance, in the well-known case of *Scott v. Shepherd*, where a man threw a lighted squib which was given by another a different direction and damaged the plaintiff. But, as in many cases where the subtlety of lawyers has been exercised, though the object may have been to reconcile the rigidity of ancient forms of pleading with substantial justice, the result on the development of the law, regarded as a question of principle, is ultimately perplexing and unsatisfactory. It does not seem to us that the distinction now affords a reasonable clue to the true principles which should govern the law in cases where the line between trespass and case is very fine. The question really involved in a case like *Scott v. Shepherd* is how far the defendant is liable for the consequences of an unlawful act when such consequences were not directly intended by him, and were not the immediate result of his act. Similarly, in *Fletcher v. Rylands* we do not think much light was really thrown on the case by the use of the distinction between trespass and case. In the Court of Exchequer the decision was in the defendant's favour apparently on the ground that if the action was in case there must be negligence. The Exchequer Chamber reversed the decision on the ground that any one who brings a dangerous agent on land must keep it in at peril, but they seem rather to assume that the action was in trespass, though they do not dwell on the distinction much.

We cannot think that the real principle of the decision turned on this. It seems to us that the immediate act of the defendant was substantially a lawful act, in the sense that his immediate intention was to do a perfectly legal act, viz., to make a reservoir and store water there. This differs, it will be observed, from the case of a man trespassing unawares on his neighbour's land. There he intends to do an act which is unlawful, though he is unaware of the illegality. If this be the proper way of regarding the case of *Fletcher v. Rylands*, it is really not to be distinguished from *Nichols v. Marsland* on the ground of the distinction between trespass and case, but on other and substantial grounds. They are both substantially cases such as we are commenting on, viz., where the defendant, doing an act not in itself and directly unlawful, causes damage to another. It is obvious on reflection that the distinction between trespass and case is not the ground on which the different result in the two cases can depend. The point on which the later decision obviously turned was that the flood was the act of God. It seems clear that if the agent which had let loose the water which the defendant had stored had been an ordinary flood she would have been held liable, although in that case it would have been equally true that she only brought the water there that another agent let loose.

The principles upon which the determination of such cases depend are extremely difficult to define or express. The material distinction between *Fletcher v. Rylands* and *Nichols v. Marsland* seems to be as follows, and this we believe to be the distinction the Court of Exchequer meant to draw, though they have not thoroughly worked out the principle of it:—In the one case the then existing state of things was such that when the water was let into the reservoir it must, in the course of nature, go down into the

mine. There was no question of any act of God or extraordinary flood, or of any other agent intervening between the act and its consequences. In the other case, it was the subsequent action of an extraordinary flood intervening between the act and its consequence, and such as it must be taken could not be contemplated or expected, that did the mischief.

But, if this is the distinction, it may be argued that the decisions are difficult to reconcile. It may be said that both cannot be justified without an inconsistency of principle. It is easy to justify the decision in the latter case taken alone; it may be said that it is not reasonable that a man should be restrained from a use of his land which is apparently reasonable and lawful because a contingency which is not, *ex concessis*, at all likely to happen may possibly happen. An earthquake might conceivably occur in England and throw down walls, but it would be a strange suggestion that any cause of action should thereby be given to any one on whose house a high wall fell under these circumstances. But the decision in *Fletcher v. Rylands*, which is a decision of the House of Lords, must be taken to be the law. It may be asked what distinction can in justice be drawn between things which a man cannot contemplate or expect, because in the one case they are future, and in the other they are present. It is all one to me, with regard to the reasonableness of any mode of using my land, whether I am ignorant of a thing because it is future and no antecedent events have shown me its probability, or whether I am ignorant of an existing thing because I have no possible means of discovering it. It is as unreasonable that I should be restricted in the use of my land with reference to contingencies depending on undiscoverable existing facts as with reference to highly improbable future contingencies. It may be said, on the other hand, that if the general principle is that a man who does an act for his own benefit on his land which interferes with his neighbour's right of property is liable, even though the consequences were not such as he could possibly contemplate, why should the act of God, or in other words, the extraordinary nature of the circumstances which, combining with his previous act, produce the injurious result, make any difference? The substance of the suggestion implied in the term "act of God" is that the event is unlikely and not contemplated. Why should that make any difference when, by the terms of the general proposition, its being contemplated or not has nothing to do with the right of action, and is not an element in the tort complained of? On the other hand, if the question of the antecedent probability of the result does come in, wherein does *Fletcher v. Rylands* differ from *Nichols v. Marsland*?

Notwithstanding the apparent plausibility of this argument, we think there is an answer, and that *Fletcher v. Rylands* is right and may be reconciled with *Nichols v. Marsland*, assuming that decision to be correct and that it is sustained in the Court of Appeal, to which we understand it has been taken. The true distinction does not appear to us to be that, in the legal sense of the word "cause," the mischief in *Fletcher v. Rylands* was caused by the act of the defendant, whereas in *Nichols v. Marsland* it was not. We do not use the well-known terms *causa causans* and *causa sine qua non*, because we do not think those terms of themselves sufficient to indicate the distinction between liability and non-liability. What we mean is that the law as a general principle limits its recognition of the connection between one thing and another as cause and effect. In *Fletcher v. Rylands* the act of the defendant directly caused the mischief. There were other things pre-existing without which the act of the defendant would not have been injurious, but the act of the defendant acting upon the existing state of things was the direct cause of the mischief. In *Nichols v. Marsland*, on the other hand, the mere act of the defendant did not directly cause any mischief at all. As things stood on the construction of the

reservoir, there was no mischief done. Then there comes an intervention of nature and the mischief results. If this intervention of nature had been in the ordinary course of events, the defendant might have been liable, but being extraordinary the connection between the defendant's act and the mischief is too remote.

The true expression of the rule, therefore, is not that, whenever the act is the direct and immediate cause, the defendant is liable, and, when it is not, he is not liable, because it is obvious that the intervention, in the ordinary course of events, of any other agent would make the act not the direct and immediate cause, and, as we have said before, the defendant may be responsible when another agent, in the ordinary course of events, intervenes. We think that the true rule is that, where the act of the defendant is the direct immediate cause of the mischief, or where, though not the direct and immediate cause of the mischief, the intervention of other causes is in the ordinary course of nature, and such as may be expected, the defendant is liable; but where the direct immediate cause of mischief is not the defendant's act, and the intervention of the intervening cause is extraordinary, the damage is not sufficiently connected with the defendant's act to form a cause of action. We rather seek for an explanation of the principle among the class of ideas connected with remoteness of damage than in the distinctions between trespass and case. The distinction on this ground between *Fletcher v. Rylands* and *Nichols v. Marsland* is of a most substantial character, and one which depends on considerations well known to the law. To render a man liable for the direct consequences of his acts combining with an existing state of things, or for the indirect consequences of his acts combined with future conditions which may be expected to arise in the ordinary course of events, is a very different thing from making him responsible for the indirect consequences of his acts combining with any future condition which may come into existence for all time, and however unexpected. The liability in the former case has natural and reasonable limits; there is hardly any limit to the liability in the latter case. We think that the true principle of the decision in *Nichols v. Marsland* is that the damage was too remote.

The following are the special questions for discussion at the Social Science Congress to be held at Liverpool in October next:—International Law Section: What are the limitations within which extradition should be recognized as an international duty? Municipal Law Section: (1) Are any, and what, modifications necessary in the present law of bankruptcy? (2) What has been the effect of the Judicature Acts on the interests of the commercial classes and suitors generally, and what amendments are needed? (3) What alterations are required in the present state of the law affecting maritime contracts? Repression of Crime Section: (1) In what respect can the present system of police supervision be improved and extended? (2) What legislation is necessary for the repression of crimes of violence?

The Midland Circuit reporter of the *Times* says:—It may be convenient to mention that about eighteen causes were not entered at Leeds within the proper time, owing to the desire of the solicitors engaged to have their respective cases low down upon the list. The associate stated that the solicitors stood round, each waiting for the other to enter, until at last there was not time for those remaining to put them down on the list at all. Upon application being made by various counsel to have their respective causes entered, the learned judge refused to allow the entry of any causes not already entered, unless affidavits were produced showing that the party had no opportunity of entering it in time. The mistake appears in part to have been caused by a different system being adopted as to balloting for places on the list from that formerly in use when Leeds formed a part of the Midland Circuit. Some of the causes so omitted were, on special application, allowed to be put down on the list for trial.

The New Practice.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS—STAYING EXECUTION PENDING APPEAL—JUDICATURE ACT, 1875, ss. 2, 21; ORD. 58, rr. 1, 16.—On the 22nd inst., in a case of *Justice v. The Mersey Steel and Iron Company, Lanyon*, on behalf of the defendants, applied *ex parte* to the Court of Appeal for a stay of execution of the judgment in favour of the plaintiffs pending an appeal to the House of Lords which the defendants were about to present. He stated that the plaintiffs were now in a position at once to issue execution, and it was apprehended that they would do so. The action had been commenced in 1873 in the Court of Common Pleas, and in November, 1875, judgment had been given by the Common Pleas Division in favour of the defendants. The decision was, in June, 1876, reversed by the Court of Appeal, who gave judgment for the plaintiffs for £4,500 and costs. The plaintiffs were resident in America. The Court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) said, as they have said before, that an order staying execution could not be made *ex parte*. Lord Justice Mellish observed that there was nothing in the Judicature Acts and Rules to alter the proceedings upon an appeal to the House of Lords. Formerly there could be no stay of execution upon an appeal from the Exchequer Chamber to the House of Lords unless the appellant gave bail in error; if he did this a stay of execution was a matter of right. On the other hand, on appeals from the Court of Chancery to the House of Lords there was no stay of execution without a special order of the Court of Chancery. It was not clear whether there was now any such difference between appeals to the House of Lords in actions in the Chancery Division, and appeals in actions in the common law divisions. His lordship suggested whether the applicants might not give bail in error as under the old practice, to which *Lanyon* replied that bail in error is now abolished. Lord Justice Mellish said that it was only abolished by the Judicature Acts and Rules as between the High Court and the Court of Appeal. *Lanyon*, however, answered that there is now no machinery for the purpose. Sir R. Baggallay observed that section 2 of the Act of 1875 provides that, till the 1st of November, 1876, appeals may be brought to the House of Lords from any judgment or order of the Court of Appeal in cases in which appeals might have been brought under the old practice. *Lanyon* urged that r. 16 of ord. 58 enabled the Court of Appeal to order a stay of execution, but the court were inclined to think that that rule referred only to appeals from the High Court to the Court of Appeal, and not to appeals from the latter court to the House of Lords. Ultimately, the court gave leave to serve short notice of motion for the 24th inst. On that day the application was renewed upon notice. *Lanyon* said that he had made inquiries as to the practice, and he believed that the old rule under section 151 of the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852 as to giving bail upon appeals to the House of Lords still prevails with respect to the common law divisions. Though proceedings in error are abolished by ord. 58, r. 1, that could not refer to appeals to the House of Lords. Lord Justice Mellish said that if that was so the Court of Appeal ought not to interfere. The Court of Exchequer Chamber never interfered under such circumstances. When that court had given its judgment upon an appeal, the case went back to the court from which it came to execute the judgment. *Lanyon* then said that the defendants were in this difficulty: that in strictness, under section 151, their time for putting in bail had expired, but that that section gave power to some court to extend the time, and he urged that the Court of Appeal could grant an extension of time. The defendants had not yet lodged a memorandum under section 149 of the Common Law Procedure Act, and they wanted an extension of four days. The Court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.), however, came to the conclusion that they had no jurisdiction in the matter. After the Court of Appeal had pronounced its judgment it was *functus officio*. The judgment became that of the High Court, and the divisional court alone could grant an extension of the time for putting in bail. The Court, however, did not encourage an application of the

kind, the only ground for which appeared to be that the defendants did not know that the old practice remained in force.

NEW TRIAL—TIME FOR MOVING—DIVISIONAL COURT NOT SITTING—ORD. 39, r. 1; ORD. 57, r. 2.—On the 26th inst., in a case of *Hallums v. Hills, Cowie*, on behalf of the defendant, applied *ex parte* to the Court of Appeal, by way of appeal from the refusal of a divisional court to grant a rule *nisi* for a new trial. The action was commenced in the Exchequer Division. It was tried on July 11, at Maidstone, before Lord Coleridge, C.J., when a verdict was found for the plaintiff. At this time no divisional court was sitting. A divisional court sat on the 17th of July, and again on the 24th of July, but not between those days. On the 24th of July, an application was made on behalf of the defendant for a rule *nisi* for a new trial, on the ground that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence. The court (Lord Coleridge, C.J., Quain, J., and Pollock, B.) refused the application, on the ground that it was made too late. They held that, though the divisional court was not in fact sitting while the judges were absent on circuit, still the court was constructively, or in contemplation of law, sitting so long as the time appointed for the Trinity Sittings continued, and, therefore, the motion had not been made within the four days fixed by ord. 39, r. 1. *Cowie* pointed out that under the old practice a motion for a new trial in a case tried at the assizes never had to be made during the circuits, as it could only be made in term, and the assizes were never held during term. *Mellish*, L.J., said that when the new rule was framed it was never contemplated that a divisional court would be sitting once a week during the circuits. And he added that under the old practice the four days for moving for a new trial did not include Sundays, or any other day on which the court did not actually sit in *Banc*. Even now, by ord. 57, r. 2, Sundays are not to be counted in the four days, and why should a week day on which the court does not sit be counted, any more than a Sunday? Ultimately, the court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) held that the decision appealed from was wrong on the construction of the rule, and that they ought to hear the motion, and they accordingly heard it, refusing it, however, upon the merits. *Mellish*, L.J., said that when a case had been tried at the assizes, and the divisional court was sitting only once a week, the four days for moving for a new trial must be four days upon which the divisional court was actually sitting. If the view of the divisional court as to the meaning of the rule was right, the result would be this: If a case was tried at the assizes, and the verdict was not given until late in the evening at a place far distant from London, if it happened that the following day was the day for the sitting of the divisional court, it would be practically impossible for a motion for a new trial to be made on that day, and if the court did not sit again for a week, it would then be too late to make the motion, and thus the parties would be deprived altogether of the right to apply for a new trial. This would be so monstrous a conclusion that, as James, L.J.J., said, the court must put a more reasonable construction upon the rule.

STRIKING OUT WHOLE STATEMENT OF CLAIM—SCANDALOUS AND IRRELEVANT MATTER—ORD. 27, r. 1.—In a case of *Cassin v. Cradock* an order was made by Vice-Chancellor Bacon to strike out the whole of the plaintiff's statement of claim as being scandalous and irrelevant and an abuse of the practice of the court. The statement alleged a great variety of causes of action. The order was affirmed by the Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) on the 26th inst., the defendants not being called upon. Baggallay, J.A., however, expressed some doubt as to the power of the court to make the order, especially having regard to the provisions ofords. 18 and 17.

ATTENDANCE OF COUNSEL.—In the divisional court at Westminster, on the 25th inst., on an application being made to allow a motion for a new trial to be postponed in order that the counsel who was present at the trial might appear, the case having been tried on circuit, the court stated that they would not extend the time for moving in circuit cases unless special circumstances were shown to justify the application.

Recent Decisions.

CHILD EN VENTRE SA MERE.

(*Re Emery's Estate*, V.C.H., 24 W. R. 917.)

The tide seems lately to have turned against children *en ventre sa mère*. In our student days, one of the strongest impressions we received was that nothing was too good for a person so fortunate as not yet to have been born. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*—our ignorance about him made us think him worthy, not only of every blessing, but also of absolute immunity from every ill. Born, he would share the common lot, good and bad alike; but nothing save good could happen to him while still unborn, and an anxious watch would always be kept that no good thing that could possibly fall to him, if visible, should fail of falling to him on account of his invisibility. But, as we have hinted, there have recently been symptoms of a revolt against this mysterious object of reverential regard. The modern mind is rising in protest against the dim object of ancestral worship. *Malins*, V.C., recently fastened on him the disability of illegitimacy, holding him, in fact, to be born before his proper time, and that for the sole purpose of his own disadvantage (see *Re Corlass's Estate*, 24 W. R. 204, and our observations thereon *ante*, p. 149). The way thus cleared, *Hall*, V.C., has struck in with a more direct blow (see *Re Emery's Estate*, 24 W. R. 917). Shortly stated, the decision amounts to this: that, whereas in the bequest of a sum to each of the three children of A., if there are four children of A. actually born at the date of the will, each of the four will take, this rule shall not apply where the fourth is *en ventre sa mère*. This, it will be seen, is a direct limitation of the old rule as to children of this kind. It is quite certain that, if a testator thought there were three when in reality there were four, the youngest being an hour old, all four would take; but the Vice-Chancellor holds that if there are three and one an hour off being born, only the three shall take. His lordship refers to "the common understanding of mankind," but this would destroy the whole doctrine of children in existence but not born. The legal understanding of the legal portion of mankind is what we have to look to; and that understanding says that a child is legally born some time before its actual birth.

SALE OF TRUST PROPERTY CONJOINTLY WITH PROPERTY NOT SUBJECT TO THE TRUST.

(*Morris v. Debenham*, V.C.M., 24 W. R. 635, L.R. 2 Ch. D. 540.)

The principles which should be borne in mind by trustees for sale with reference to selling trust property conjointly with other property not subject to the trust were clearly laid down by the late Lord Justice Turner in *Rede v. Oakes* (13 W. R. 303, 4 De G. J. & S., at p. 513, 10 Jur. N. S. 1247). They are these: trustees may safely sell the trust property conjointly with other property not subject to the trust, provided such sale will be advantageous to the trust property; but they must take care (1) that the trust property is not injured by the manner in which the sale is made, and (2) that the portion of the proceeds to be attributed to the trust property can be settled on some fair basis. The first of these conditions is broken if, when the trust property is sold with other property as to which special and depreciatory conditions are made, the particulars and conditions of sale do not specify the extent of property to which the special conditions relate (*Rede v. Oakes*); for in this case it is obvious that the purchaser may fancy that the special conditions relate to the greater part of the property, and may diminish his bid accordingly. The second condition was said, in *Rede v. Oakes*, to be broken if the portion of the proceeds belonging to the trust property is left to rest upon conjecture, or to be settled by the

arbitrary discretion of the trustees. If the sale takes place under the direction of the court, and the conditions provide that the purchase-money is to be paid into court, no difficulty will arise on this score; the court will see that the money is properly apportioned between the persons interested in the portion under administration by the court and the owners of the other property included in the sale (*Cavendish v. Cavendish*, 23 W. R. 313, L. R. 10 Ch. 321). And in other cases there would seem to be no reason why the trustees should not make the apportionment after the sale according to the same means as the court would adopt, viz., by the estimate of impartial surveyors. In *Morris v. Debenham*, however, it seems to have been contended that trustees could not make the apportionment after the sale, although, by affidavit, two independent surveyors had fixed the proportion to be paid to the owners of each portion of the property. Malins, V.C., overruled this objection, and made the defendant who raised it pay the costs. The result is not, as it seems to us, to impeach *Rede v. Oakes*, although the Vice-Chancellor appears to have rather gone out of his way to attack that case. It still remains the law that trustees selling the trust property with other property not subject to the trust must see, first, that the conjoint sale will be beneficial to the trust property; next, that no injury is done to the latter by the manner of sale; and, lastly, that the apportionment of the purchase-money is made on some fair basis; but such means as the court itself would adopt for ascertaining the proportion of the purchase-money belonging to the trust estate will be deemed to be such a fair basis.

Reviews.

EVIDENCE.

A DIGEST OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE. By JAMES FITZ JAMES STEPHEN, Q.C. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

It is quite impossible within the limits of a review to give any adequate notice of this important work. If we could merely regard it as a contribution to legal literature, we might be content to record our opinion of it at such length as this part of our columns would allow. But we look upon it as being, not so much a private treatise in a compendious form, as a public work destined to become, perhaps at no distant date, a code of the law of evidence. And it is with great satisfaction that we contemplate this probability. It has been our view, frequently expressed, that, apart from the consolidation of statutes, codification of the law ought to begin with the law of procedure; and now that this branch is approaching towards completion, though yet at a good distance from it, in what relates to the constitution of the courts, it seems a fit time to throw into a formal shape that branch of procedure which relates to evidence. No one has paid so much attention to this subject as Mr. Stephen, and no one is more competent to deal with it. But great and valuable as are the services which he has rendered in the compilation of this work, we venture to think it not yet perfect; and we will hereafter submit to the judgment of our readers, and to his own, some points on which we are compelled to differ from him.

In the meanwhile, we can assure our readers that their time will be well spent in perusing this compact and very able work. It is needless to say that it is framed upon the model of the Indian Code; but it is important to add that it appears to us, in many essential points, vastly superior to it. And perhaps, from this fact, some would draw the not unreasonable inference that it is a surer road to successful work to digest into a code the existing law, than to indulge the fancy in speculative legislation. We do not doubt at all that the Indian Code has, in the country for which it was designed, been of great service; but we should regard its introduction in

this country as nothing less than a public misfortune. Of the present work, however, we can say that, though in our judgment it needs careful revision, it is so free from the most objectionable features of the Indian Code and is, upon the whole, so faithful and able a representation in compact outline of the existing law, that we could view its introduction as a code without alarm. This much must suffice for the present; but we hope before long to return to the subject and deal with it at greater length.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT.

THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. c. 92) : WITH STATUTES, ORDERS, AND FORMS, AND NOTES. By CHARLES WELLWIN RADCLIFFE COOKE, Barrister-at-Law. H. Sweet.

Mr. Cooke sets out, rather ungracefully, by running down the treatises which have already appeared on the Agricultural Holdings Act. He says that in many instances the notices that they desire their existing tenancies from year to year or at will to remain unaffected by the Act have been given by the parties to such tenancies, not because they dislike the Act, "but as a measure of precaution, and in order that they may have time to observe its operation where it has been adopted, and to learn something more than they now know, or can gather from the small treatises upon the Act that have been written, of its real scope and effect." It is pleasing, if a little surprising, to find this cautious diffidence in English farmers and landowners. As the Act is in plain English, and has been obtainable for many months at a trifling cost, there would seem to be nothing to prevent farmers and landowners from obtaining a knowledge of its provisions; and as they have usually some little experience of agricultural matters, it is conceivable that they might deem themselves competent to judge of the desirability of adopting it without resorting to treatises either small or large. We have reason to believe that many misguided agriculturists have done so. Mr. Cooke's remark quoted above seems to imply that many persons in the agricultural world distrust small treatises, and are waiting for a large one—that farmers think that treatises, like turnips, ought to weigh well. We can say at once that, judged by this test, Mr. Cooke's book ought to satisfy the agricultural world. It contains 212 pages of closely printed matter, and we do not think that the most devoted admirer of big books could ask for more on an Act of sixty sections. Moreover, it presents the provisions of the measure in many different forms. We have the Act with notes; the Act without notes; a summary of the Act in the form of "General Observations"; and a short statement of its effect in the introduction. Turning to the notes, the first thing we have to observe upon is their number and length. Nearly every section has its note, whether any explanation is really needed or not. Thus, to section 3, "This Act shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland," there is a note commencing, "The Act, therefore, extends only to England," and the last sentence but one of which contains the preamble to the Reform Act of 1867. To several of the definitions there are notes quoting the definitions in the Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870, and in many of the notes lengthy reference is made to the provisions of that measure and of Bills which were before Parliament anterior to the passing of the Agricultural Holdings Act. We cannot imagine what advantage all this will be to the farmer or landowner desirous of informing himself as to the provisions of the Act of 1875. On the other hand, on some points as to which the tenant or landlord might desire somewhat full information, but little is vouchsafed. Thus the note to section 53 (fixtures) gives no explanation of what are fixtures, and no account of the state of the law as to agricultural fixtures independently of 14 & 15 Vict. c. 25. Nor in the note to section 51, relating to notice to quit, is the require-

ment that a notice to quit must expire with the end of some current year of the tenancy explained, nor are the decisions upon the questions which often arise as to ascertaining the time of expiration of the tenancy alluded to. Nor, in the note to section 18, is attention drawn to the important circumstance that the "agreement connected with the contract of tenancy," for breach of which the tenant is entitled to obtain compensation from the landlord, need not be an agreement in writing, and that in this way the class of parol agreements held valid in *Morgan v. Griffiths* (19 W. R. 957) and *Erskine v. Adeane* (21 W. R. 802) are apparently admitted as subjects for compensation. On the whole, however, the fault of the work is not omission but overloading. The notes are usually accurate, and the "General Observations" contain clear and useful directions to landlord and tenant as to proceedings under the Act. The statutes, county court rules, and forms are given in the appendix, and there is a very full index.

Notes

TILL RECENTLY it had been the practice of the Court of Chancery, when money had been paid into court under the Lands Clauses Act for the purchase of a settled estate, to pay it out to a tenant in tail without requiring that a disentailing deed should be executed. But in the recent case of *Re Butler's Will* (L. R. 16 Eq. 479) Lord Selborne, when sitting for the Master of the Rolls, refused to follow this practice, and required that a disentailing deed should be executed. In a subsequent case of *Re Wood's Settled Estates* (L. R. 20 Eq. 372), under the Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act, Vice-Chancellor Malone followed the old practice, but in the more recent case of *Re Broadwood's Settled Estates* (L. R. 1 Ch. D. 438) the Master of the Rolls required a disentailing deed to be executed. The question was raised again before James and Mellish, L.J.J., on the 15th inst., in a lunatic petition of *Re Reynolds*, when they said that they should follow Lord Selborne's decision. The practice may now, we suppose, be considered as settled.

A CURIOUS POINT of trade-mark law was recently discussed before the Master of the Rolls. The plaintiffs alleged that they had introduced into Germany and England the use of the word "Laferme" in connection with cigarettes manufactured by them. By German law there can be no trade-mark consisting of a mere word—hence, they had been unable to prevent several manufacturers of cigarettes in Germany from also using the word "Laferme." The defendants were the English agents of one of these German manufacturers, and the plaintiffs sought to restrain the use of the word "Laferme" in England on packets of cigarettes made in Germany and there marked "Laferme." The argument on the part of the plaintiffs was that they had, by sole user of the word in England, acquired the right to it as an English trade-mark, notwithstanding that the defendants' manufacturers had done no legal wrong in packing the cigarettes in Germany with the word "Laferme" on them. The Master of the Rolls intimated that, had a decision upon the point been necessary, he would have given it against the plaintiffs upon the ground that in Germany the word "Laferme" did not denote that the article in connection with which it was used was manufactured by the plaintiffs, and that in England the word itself could merely denote that the articles were made in Germany. As to the plaintiffs' argument he said that, carried to its logical conclusion, it would enable one of two manufacturers in Germany to steal the trade-mark of the other, and, by a prior use of the stolen trade-mark in England, to prevent the real owner from ever using his own trade-mark in England.

IN THE CASES OF *Ex parte Aynsworth* (4 Ves. 678) and *Ex parte Pigou* (3 Mad. 136) it was held that where goods are sold by a manufacturer to a retail dealer upon the terms

that if they are paid for within a specified time a large discount (in *Ex parte Pigou* it was twenty per cent.) from the invoice price is to be allowed, proof cannot be admitted in the bankruptcy of the purchaser for the whole debt without deduction of the discount, even if the goods have not been paid for within the specified time. In a case of *Re Cumberland*, decided by the Chief Judge on the 24th inst., a firm of brewers had sold ale to a retail dealer on the terms that he was to be allowed a discount of twenty per cent. from the invoice price of the ale on payment by him in cash in one month from the first day of the month following the delivery. He gave the brewers acceptances for some of the monthly payments, credit being then given for the discount, but these acceptances were dishonoured at maturity. The purchaser filed a liquidation petition, under which his creditors resolved to accept a composition. The judge of the Bradford County Court held that the brewers could not be allowed to prove for the full price of the ale, but only for the price less the discount. His Honour thought that the discount was a trade discount, not a cash discount, and that the purchaser was entitled to it in any event. The Chief Judge said that, upon the evidence, he could not recognize any such distinction. The acceptances having been dishonoured, the cash payments had not in fact been made, and the debtor was not entitled to receive the discount. The proof must therefore be admitted for the full price. Another reason for admitting it was this, that at the first meeting of the creditors the brewers had been allowed to prove for the full amount, and to vote in respect of that proof, without any objection on the part of the debtor. The creditors had, therefore, assented to the composition on the footing of the sum proved for being due to the brewers, and the debtor, at any rate, was estopped from saying that that sum was not due.

THE DIVISIONAL COURT had before it, on the 25th inst., a case of *In the Matter of Edward Lewis*, which Mr. Justice Lindley had referred to the court as he thought it involved a discussion of public interest in reference to the practice of solicitors practising in the criminal courts. A solicitor had been retained to defend the prisoner, and a sum of £300 had been paid by the relatives of the prisoner to that solicitor, and in return he gave a receipt with the words "being the amount agreed on as costs, &c.," or to that effect. The clients subsequently cancelled the retainer of the solicitor before the prisoner came up for trial at the Central Criminal Court, and another solicitor was retained. An application was then made for an order calling on the first solicitor to send in his bill of costs for taxation, to which it was answered that there was an agreed sum paid, within the Attorneys and Solicitors Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 28). The application was now renewed in court. A doubt was expressed by Mr. Justice Quain as to whether costs in criminal business were within the Act, looking at the terms of the proviso to section 4 referring to "any action at law or suit in equity"; but it was pointed out that the words of the earlier part of the section "business done or to be done . . . as an advocate or conveyancer," coupled with section 8, showed that the Act could not be narrowed by the proviso to section 4. The case involved considerable contradictions in fact as to whether any agreement was come to, and whether the terms of the receipt were assented to, but these became immaterial, as the court (Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Quain, J.) decided that the receipt did not amount to "an agreement in writing with his client" as intended by section 4, but that the agreement there contemplated was one written by both the parties to it, i.e., signed by them; the analogies attempted to be drawn from the cases under the Statute of Frauds failed, because there the Act limited its requirements to a signature by the party to be charged. One further difficulty was started, viz., that costs could not be taxed in the superior courts under 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, when the business was in a police-court only, but this was set at rest by a statement of the Master of the Crown Office that such costs were constantly taxed.

It is stated that about 250 cases were left untried at the termination of the London Sittings.

PARLIAMENTARY AGENTS.

THE following is a *verbatim* report of the speeches in the debate in the House of Lords on Monday last on this subject:—

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Lord Redesdale).—My lords, in moving that your lordships do consider this report, I will lay shortly before you what I deem to be a matter of considerable importance. Your lordships are aware that this question was mentioned in the House in the last session, and since the last session I have been in communication with certain persons with reference to parliamentary agency, not only for the purpose of securing the proper performance of the duties of parliamentary agents, but for the purpose of taking steps by which the public may be assured that the persons who are appointed as parliamentary agents are proper persons to take charge of the private Bills which are brought before your lordships. One of the first steps that I took was to suggest that there should be a conference of the two Houses, in consequence of which a joint committee of your lordships' House and the House of Commons was appointed, and your lordships now have before you the report from them of their investigation into this matter.

Now, my lords, the report of that joint committee decidedly recommends that there should be a recognized body of professional parliamentary agents, and I must say that any one of your lordships who has anything to do with the details of the private Bills which are introduced into Parliament must be aware that it is very important for the public interests that those Bills should be put into the hands of persons who are capable of conducting them through Parliament in the best possible way, and I now assure your lordships that it is not for the purpose of closing the doors of this House against persons who are desirous of undertaking the discharge of the duties of parliamentary agents, but what the joint committee recommends is that they should be undertaken only by persons who are well acquainted with the details of parliamentary business by having acted in the capacity of assistant-parliamentary agents in both Houses of Parliament for some years, and who will consequently be in a position to understand the details of the business, and be able to pass such an examination as it may be desired should take place.

My lords, I think that such a provision as this will be a very good one, and, if these recommendations are carried out, in future no person will be allowed to practise as a parliamentary agent unless he is able to satisfy the counsel of the two Houses of Parliament as to his capability of conducting the business of a parliamentary agent, and I do not think that a more convenient course can be devised, or one which would better secure the efficient performance of the work; and, looking at the large number of parliamentary agents which it is proposed should be allowed to be upon the rolls, I must say that I do not think it is too much to expect that they should pass some properly qualifying examination. I think that the effect will be that in a short time those alone will be allowed to be upon the rolls in whom the public may have confidence, and who at the same time enjoy the confidence of members of both Houses of Parliament. My lords, I know of my own knowledge that a number of solicitors and other persons must come to be instructed as to the manner in which they are to perform their duties in my office, and it is perfectly obvious that the business will be more economically conducted than it is if such persons only as were qualified to take the business were allowed to conduct it. I am quite aware, my lords, that a number of applications have been made from country solicitors and others asking for the postponement of the making of any orders and of coming to any determination on the subject, because they say there has not been time to investigate it. But, for my part, I confess I do not know what they can have to do with the question. The only point which is really before us is whether or not persons who undertake the business of parliamentary agents should, or not, be fully qualified for the work, and I believe the recommendation of the report will be unanimously approved of.

Your lordships are aware, having the report before you, that up to the year 1837 the whole of the parliamentary business in the House was carried on in the office of the Clerk of the Parliaments in this House and the clerk in the House of Commons, but the constantly increasing pressure of business at that time rendered it necessary to have the

assistance of an independent class of persons, and the consequence was that a large number of solicitors and other persons interested in getting Bills through Parliament came forward to undertake the business, but when that was done there was this state of things, that it was necessary, in promoting any private Bills, to engage one of the persons who put themselves forward as parliamentary agents, and it is in order to secure that persons who are so employed must be perfectly competent to fulfil the duties of the office that this inquiry has been instituted. Your lordships will see that the occupation of a parliamentary agent does interfere with the performance of other professional business, and other professional business in the same way interferes with the proper performance of parliamentary duties. Considerable inconvenience has been found to result from the fact that some persons have set themselves up as parliamentary agents who never had any business in Parliament either from the country or in London, but who merely undertook of their own accord to get Bills through Parliament. Evidence was given before the committee upon this point, and the committee unanimously report that such was a very reprehensible practice. My lords, I do not know that I need say anything more, and the report itself sets out all the facts and details of the whole subject. I shall therefore move that your lordships do agree with the report.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—My lords, I was not aware that my noble friend was going to make the statement which he has made, or to propose any motion upon the subject. From the notice that was given I thought that it was only intended that this report should be laid upon the table.

Naturally, any suggestion from him comes with great force from the weight that attaches to his office. This report deals with a very important subject. It was only ordered to be printed this week, and I don't know what day it was brought in and laid upon the table of your lordships' House. But I do think it is a very hasty proceeding to move at the end of a week to agree to no less than nineteen resolutions dealing with very important subjects in various ways, and as to which there is certain to be considerable difference of opinion.

My lords, it is proposed by this report to do that which I think it is not necessary to do, and that is to create an exclusive body of practitioners to practise before your lordships as parliamentary agents. That may or may not be necessary, and upon that I will not now express an opinion, but I will say this, that it ought not to be done except upon full notice being given to all who are concerned. It seems to me that some of the provisions with regard to this body are very singular. In the first place, it is said that the examinations for admission to the roll of solicitors or for the admission of gentlemen to practise at the bar are not a sufficient qualification for the admission of gentlemen as parliamentary agents to practise before your lordships' House, but that in addition to this examination there should be some special examination to entitle them to admission.

Now, my lords, I should like to hear from my noble friend what is the special examination which he proposes should be the test of admission to practise as a parliamentary agent. Is it to be one upon the law?

Lord REDESDALE.—Upon parliamentary practice.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Upon parliamentary practice. But if that is so I want to know what parliamentary practice really is, and it will be necessary to agree upon some definition of it. But, my lords, there is this objection to such an examination—that any special examination upon only a limited number of subjects must necessarily be considerably smaller and more restricted than examinations into general subjects, and I do maintain that persons who are fit to be on the roll of solicitors, and fit to be called to the bar, are undoubtedly fit to practise as parliamentary agents in your lordships' House or in the other House of Parliament, and they would, in a few weeks, or even in a few days, be able to acquire all the special knowledge which it is necessary to attain in order to promote the passage of private Bills through Parliament. But what I say is that we ought to know what it is to be the nature and character of the special examination for those who now profess the business of a parliamentary agent. I quite admit that any parliamentary agent or solicitor who practises before your lordships who is guilty of a neglect of any of your lordships' rules or of personal misconduct of any kind should be amenable to censure, and it may be necessary to have a power to exclude persons who

July 29, 1876.

have misconducted themselves from the privilege of practising before your lordships and the other House in the capacity of parliamentary agents. But this is a very sweeping authority which it is proposed to confer upon my noble friend by these recommendations—that for any neglect of the rules upon any subject my noble friend in this House, and the right honourable gentleman the Speaker in the other House, should have power to prevent any person who has, perhaps, given up his whole life and all his professional prospects in other walks for the privilege of being allowed to practise as a parliamentary agent, that he is, upon a mere *fact* of that kind, and, perhaps, without there being any previous examination or inquiry of any kind, to be removed altogether out of that line of business which he has chosen, and forbidden any more to practise before your lordships' or the other House.

My lords, with the greatest possible confidence in my noble friend, and the greatest possible confidence in the right honourable gentleman the Speaker in the other House of Parliament, I think this would be a very strong power to place in their hands without any check whatever.

My noble friend referred to another subject upon which I am only imperfectly informed, and upon which I have received no information whatever from the committee. The committee have come to certain conclusions with respect to the charges of parliamentary agents and solicitors, but I have not been informed by the committee what are the facts they have ascertained, and what are the arguments which have led them to those conclusions. There is one thing that it is very desirable that your lordships should bear in mind, and that is, how do you propose to enforce this? Does my noble friend think it practicable to deliver a scale of fees to parliamentary agents according to the practice of the law courts as respects the remuneration of solicitors at present? Do you suppose that any parliamentary agent will ever be at the pains of making out all the details of the charges for passing a Bill through Parliament? Will it not be perfectly possible for any parliamentary agent to make an agreement for himself? Do not solicitors themselves often make an agreement for their costs? Whatever scale of remuneration we might choose to fix, would they not have a right to say, "That is the contract which we make, and we make our claim against the person who is the solicitor of the Bill"? I can only say that the division of fees is allowed in the profession, as is perfectly well known, and I am not sure that there may not be a similar provision with respect to parliamentary agents. The committee has not informed us upon that point, or on what ground they have proceeded in this matter. It has been stated to me that the committee founded their views as to the necessity of insisting upon special qualifications for a parliamentary agent upon the evidence which was given to the joint committee, and I find that one of the instances of the necessity for that which was given was in reference to an important Bill upon a subject which has, in some way or other, attracted considerable attention out of doors—a Bill which passed through this House conferring certain powers upon the corporation of Birmingham last year, and when it came into his office, I am informed by a communication, the counsel of my noble friend said that the Bill must be sent to counsel to prepare and draft, and that it was unworthy of a great corporation like that of Birmingham to submit to Parliament so important a Bill without its being submitted first to counsel to be properly settled, and he said that the Bill had been introduced by a parliamentary agent who was a member of a large firm of solicitors, but not in much practice as a parliamentary agent. Now I am authorized to say that this Bill was drawn by Mr. Reilly. I have myself seen the Bill—I have occasion to see the learned counsel about various things, and I have seen this Bill—and I am bound to say that a more properly drawn Bill, still more worthy of being termed a work of art with respect to the manner in which it is drafted, I have not seen, and I consider it a very unfortunate instance to bring forward to sustain charges of that kind made before the committee. I do press my noble friend not to ask your lordships to do to come to any conclusion upon the subject, which may very well stand over until it becomes more perfectly known what their determination really is.

Lord REDESDALE.—In deference to the opinion of the noble and learned lord on the woolsack I will not press it; but at the same time I must say that, in my opinion, all the arrangements that are necessary to be made might

be made in a very short time, and before the House breaks up for the parliamentary recess. In regard to one point, namely, the mode of dealing with any parliamentary agents who act in violation of the rules or wilfully misconduct themselves while prosecuting any proceedings in Parliament, I may observe that the power really exists, and is exercised at the present moment by the Speaker in the other House, but no one who has not my experience in parliamentary practice in this House can have the slightest notion of the inconvenience occasioned by want of proper conduct in these matters. All I can say is that I know the committee were disposed fairly to consider the subject, and heartily concurred in the suggestions that were made for the purpose of insuring the proper conduct of the private business. Under the circumstances I will not press the motion I have made upon the present occasion, but I wish to impress upon your lordships that the subject is a very important one.

The EARL OF CAMPERDOWN.—Perhaps your lordships will permit me to say that the committee were unanimous in their report, and that we were strongly of opinion that all the rules which have been proposed are absolutely necessary. I propose, however, to defer any observations which I may have to make upon the subject until the report is brought regularly before the House.

The motion was then withdrawn, and the report of the committee was ordered to be laid upon the table of the House.

IRISH JURIES.

In charging the grand jury at Armagh Assizes, on the 17th inst., Mr. Justice Fitzgerald said he had seen, and with great concern, a number of cases of great magnitude in which there had been a total failure of justice. Sometimes there had been verdicts given which the most experienced minds would pronounce, not only not in accordance with the evidence, but absolutely against the evidence produced before the jury. Cases of the greatest magnitude resulted in what were called disagreements between juries, although the evidence before them was very strong. He did not mean to insinuate that these failures of justice had proceeded from any corruption or misconduct on the part of the jury. It might have been ignorance, want of experience in the performance of their duties, or want of education; but in many cases the minds of persons of that class were unconsciously warped by external circumstances. But, from whatever causes, there was no doubt of the truth of it, and most of his colleagues on the bench would echo the sentiment, that the continuance of such a state of things struck at the very foundation of justice and rendered the rights of the public insecure. He would not have made these observations if it were not for the aggravated state of things which he observed, and that he believed they had, to a great extent, a remedy in their own hands. He was speaking from unfortunate experience of the whole of Ireland, save, perhaps, the metropolitan county, when he said that jurors had been in the habit of absenting themselves from the assize town, and taking their chance of being fined, and even submitting to it rather than perform their duties. The result was natural. The duties which were thus abnegated fell into the hands of a humbler class of persons—perhaps a class of jurors anxious to do what was right, but persons having no experience, and, perhaps, very little education—who unconsciously were subject to personal apprehension and other external causes. This was a great misfortune, and if gentlemen abdicated their rights they were allowing the bulwarks of public safety to pass into inferior hands. The present occasion afforded him an opportunity of saying a word to the public on this subject, with a view to impress on gentlemen of station, whether grand jurors or magistrates, no matter how high they were, the duty which the public safety rendered it incumbent on them to perform when summoned on a jury. He was not by those observations exciting class feeling; but in his own experience he had repeatedly seen jurors going wrong who were anxious to do what was right. It would be a great satisfaction to him if, in calling attention to this matter, he found that a more satisfactory performance of their duties by jurors would be the result. He believed there was an Act to in-

crease the qualifications of jurors, which might reduce the evil he pointed out, but it would not achieve the object if gentlemen abstained from serving on juries.

Societies.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The annual dinner of this society took place at the Criterion, Regent-circus, on Wednesday, the 19th inst. The chair was taken by Mr. J. T. Davies, and there was a large number of the members and friends of the society present. The usual loyal toasts having been given and duly honoured, Mr. N. Hanbart, LL.B., proposed "The Legal Profession" and in the course of his speech adverted to the observations recently made by Mr. Gladstone as to the probable future of the legal profession in comparison with that of the medical profession with regard to their influence on social progress, and stated that if the legal profession would only act in unison there was no limit to the good they might effect. Mr. Ellis J. Davis, in responding to the toast on the part of the bar, admitted that at the present time the interests of the legal profession were considered by a large section of the community to be opposed to the interests of the public, and he dwelt on the desirability of removing such an impression, and pointed out the means by which it might be removed. Mr. J. Emanuel also replied to the toast on behalf of the solicitor branch of the profession, and he took occasion to object to the other branch being spoken of as the higher branch—a distinction the members of that branch were not entitled to, either on account of any additional responsibility in the work done by them or the disinterested way in which it was done. The Chairman then proposed "Success to the Society," and in doing so he enumerated its objects and traced its history from its establishment in 1864 under the name of the Articled Clerks' Society. He explained that the name had been changed as the former name had become inapplicable, as the majority of the members having joined as articled clerks had continued their connection with the society subsequently to their becoming solicitors, and it was also thought advisable to enlarge the scope and constitution of the society by admitting members of the other branch of the profession. He referred to the unprecedented growth of the society during the preceding year, and also to the establishment of the new branch of the society, "The General Correspondence Department," which, although only formed but a few months, already included among its members a very large number of country law students. The toast was received with great enthusiasm, and Mr. W. J. Fraser, in responding, stated that when the society was first formed he was one of the most regular attendants, and he had filled almost every office in the society. The practice in the art of speaking he had thus acquired had been since of the greatest advantage to him, and he urged the gentlemen present who were not members to become so, as the benefits to be derived from persevering membership were beyond question. Mr. C. E. Beal then gave "The Officers of the Society," and from his own personal knowledge spoke of the activity of the committee, and referred in highly complimentary terms to their hon. secretary, Mr. J. S. Rubinstein, who, in replying, acknowledged the assistance he had received from the other members of the committee, and dwelt upon the success which had attended the admission into the society of barristers and bar students, which he considered the most important change that had been effected, and in conclusion stated that, having regard to the many exceptional advantages their society now enjoyed—a glorious old hall in which to hold their meetings, a president and body of vice-presidents which included the most eminent of living lawyers, a constitution so broad and comprehensive as to enable any person to become a member who was entitled to be considered a law student, a bond of sympathy between their society and all the provincial law students' societies as a result of the union existing between them, and corresponding departments of the society which enabled law students living in any part of the country to take an active interest in questions, not only of a technical character, but in those affecting their social well-being—it was safe to predict that the United Law Students' Society would

in a short time become the first, in point of numbers, success, and influence, of all the law students' societies in the kingdom. Mr. H. T. Round, LL.B., in a characteristic speech, then proposed the "Societies in Union." He alluded to the amount of correspondence the work of his department entailed upon him, and the great pleasure it gave him to reply to the numerous letters he received from country law students on every conceivable subject, and he enlarged on the beneficial results to be obtained by union, and trusted that in the course of a short time they would have one United Law Students' Society for the whole of London. Mr. J. W. Browett (late hon. secretary Birmingham Law Students' Society), in acknowledging the toast, bore testimony to the activity of Mr. Round in his official capacity, and dwelt on the advantages country societies obtained by union, and instanced the interest taken by his society in the petition promoted by the London society in support of Lord Selborne's Bill for the Incorporation of a School of Law. Mr. W. Simpson (hon. secretary Leicester Law Students' Society) also replied to the toast, and stated that the activity of the London society had had a great influence in the country societies, as shown by the increased interest which the officers and members took in those societies. The toast of "The Founders of the Society" was next proposed by Mr. W. Dawson, who, in his remarks, alluded to the part he had himself taken in the formation of the Norwich Law Students' Society. Mr. J. C. Bamond, in replying, expressed the interest with which the progress of the society was watched by its original members, but believed the society had not yet done everything it could do, and suggested that the society should have a library and reading-room of its own, which should be open at all times, and he offered to subscribe three guineas a year if the committee would undertake to form such an addition to the departments of the society. Mr. G. Whale, in proposing "The Visitors," coupled with the toast the name of Mr. W. E. Shirley as a gentleman well known for the interest taken by him in every question affecting the profession, and particularly with regard to the education of law students. Mr. W. E. Shirley (town clerk, Doncaster), in replying, expressed the great pleasure it gave him to be present that evening, and his sympathy with law students in their efforts for self-improvement. He dwelt on the qualities which commanded success, and tendered some very valuable advice to those entering the profession. The toasts of "The Dinner Committee," proposed by Mr. P. Thornton, and humorously responded to by Mr. W. Shirley Shirley, B.A., and "The Chairman," proposed by Mr. H. Lewis Arnold, and acknowledged in appropriate terms by Mr. J. T. Davies, brought the evening to a close.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting of this society held on Tuesday last, F. W. Lowe, Esq., in the chair, the following moot point was discussed:—"Is mortgagees entitled to more than six years' arrears of interest upon a bill being filed by the mortgagor for redemption?" Mr. Hadley opened the debate in the affirmative, and was supported by Mr. Pagh. Mr. Whitehouse replied in the negative, and was followed by Messrs. Hayes and Robinson. The voting was in favour of the negative. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting. This is the last meeting of the spring session.

On Saturday, Vice-Chancellor Hall announced that his paper would be altered so as to agree with the papers of the other Vice-Chancellors, and that accordingly Friday, July 28, would be the last petition day, and all petitions ordered to stand over until the last petition day would come on upon that day, and Saturday, July 29, would be the last short-cause day, and after those days no opposed petitions would be heard except "remaining" petitions, and no short causes would be heard except such as were "consent causes" or by special order. On Monday the Master of the Rolls also announced that, in consequence of Friday and Saturday being the last short-cause and petition days in the other branches of the Chancery Division, he should alter his paper, and make Saturday, the 29th of July, the last short-cause and petition day, instead of Saturday, the 5th of August. Friday, the 4th of August, will be the last motion day at the Rolls.

Obituary.

MR. WACE LOCKETT MENDHAM.

Mr. Wace Lockett Mendham, solicitor, town clerk of Norwich, died at that city on the 22nd inst., in his sixty-sixth year, after a painful illness. Mr. Mendham was born in 1809, was admitted a solicitor in 1835, and had ever since practised at Norwich. He was elected town clerk of the city in 1855 (having been previously clerk to the Norwich Burial Board), and retained the office until his death. Mr. Mendham was a Liberal in politics, and formerly took an active part in parliamentary and municipal contests, but after his election as town clerk his impartiality insured him the esteem and confidence of both parties in the council and in the borough. He was a commissioner for affidavits, and also a perpetual commissioner for the county of Norfolk and the city of Norwich. He was married to a sister of Mr. Jacob Henry Tillett, Mayor of Norwich, and late M.P. for the city (with whom he was formerly in partnership). He leaves no family.

Appointments, Etc.

MR. JOHN HENRY MICHELL BALCH, solicitor, of Bruton, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

MR. WYNNE EDWIN BAXTER, solicitor, of 9, Laurence Pountney-hill, Cannon-street, and of Lewes, has been appointed by Mr. William Quartermaine East, sheriff elect, to be one of the Under-Sheriffs of London and Middlesex for the ensuing year. Mr. Baxter was admitted a solicitor in 1867. He represents the ward of Walbrook in the Court of Common Council, and is chairman of the Law, Parliamentary, and City Courts Committee for the present year. He is also the author of a work on "Law and Practice of the Supreme Court of Justice," "Domesday Book for Sussex," &c.

MR. THOMAS BURTON, solicitor, of Wakefield and Ossett, has been elected Clerk to the Ossett-cum-Gawthorpe Local Board of Health, in the place of Mr. Joseph Stringer.

MR. DAVID PETER CHALMERS, Queen's Advocate at the Gold Coast, has received the honour of Knighthood. Mr. Chalmers was admitted an advocate of the Scotch bar in 1860. He was appointed magistrate and judicial assessor of the Gold Coast in 1869, Queen's Advocate at Sierra Leone in 1872, and Queen's Advocate at the Gold Coast in 1874.

MR. GEORGE CURRY, solicitor, of Cleckheaton, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

MR. JOSEPH EDWARD CURTEIS, solicitor, of Devonport and Stonehouse, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for Devonshire.

MR. GERALD FITZGIBBON, jun., Q.C., has been appointed Legal Adviser to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in the place of Mr. Frederick Richard Falkiner, Q.C., who has been appointed Recorder of Dublin. Mr. Fitzgibbon is the son of Mr. Gerald Fitzgibbon, Q.C., Receiver Master of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, and was called to the Irish bar in 1860. He was also called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1861. He practises on the Munster Circuit, and became a Q.C. in 1872.

MR. JAMES TAYLOR INGHAM, chief magistrate at Bow-street Police-court, has received the honour of Knighthood.

MR. JOHN AMHURST PHILPOTT, solicitor (of the firm of Farrar & Philpott), of Cranbrook, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

MR. EDWARD REYNOLDS, barrister, has been appointed to officiate as Government Pleader for the Punjab. Mr. Reynolds is a graduate of Exeter College, Oxford. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1864, and formerly practised on the Home Circuit.

MR. PHILIP ANSTIE SMITH, barrister, has been appointed

Chief Justice of the Bahama Islands. Mr. Smith was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1851, and formerly practised on the Western Circuit, and at the Wiltshire, Bath, and Bristol Sessions. He has been judge of the District Court at Montego Bay, Jamaica, since 1868.

Legal News.

On Monday the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas announced that, owing to some misapprehension, no special jurors had been yet summoned, and, some days being requisite for that purpose, no special jury case could be taken before the 1st of August.

A curious incident has happened, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, before the Tribunal of Antwerp. Two advocates, one the son of a Roman Catholic deputy, pleading there on opposite sides, had, after some sharp words, a regular set fight, which was put an end to only by the intervention of the other advocates present. The sitting of the court was suspended, and at its resumption the case was postponed.

In the Probate Division, on Thursday, says the *Times* reporter, a juror in waiting complained that though he and other jurors had been in attendance for some days, they had been called in no case. The president observed that the court could not select a jury; the jurors should be taken as their names turned up in the ballot. A juror.—Some names, my lord, turn up so regularly that it appears to me we might have as well remained at home. His lordship.—You may see that that might not have been for your advantage. The attendance of jurors has been irregular, and I fine those who have not answered to their names £10 each. A juror (with delight)—Then, my lord, we are satisfied.

At the Sheffield County Court on Wednesday, says the *Daily News*, the judge (Mr. T. Ellison) had an action before him of a very novel character. The plaintiff, Mr. J. Langley, is a merchant at Hull, and the defendants are Messrs. Smith & Sons, the well-known newsagents and book-stall keepers. In March last the plaintiff was at the Victoria Railway Station, Sheffield, and went to the defendants' book-stall. There he saw two volumes of a work by Jules Verne, each being marked one shilling. He wished to purchase one of them, but the manager of the stall said he could not sell one volume without the other. The plaintiff thereupon took up one of the volumes and tendered half a sovereign in payment. The manager, however, retained 2s. out of the half-sovereign. The plaintiff refused to take the second volume, and brought his action to recover the shilling which the manager had retained. It was contended by Mr. Porritt, who appeared for the plaintiff, that the volumes being exposed for sale, and the price marked upon them, a purchaser was entitled to insist upon buying a separate volume. Even if the plaintiff was compelled to buy the two volumes, the manager had no right to detain the other shilling against his will. His remedy was to sue for the shilling as a debt. For the defendants, it was proved that the second volume had been sent to Hull twice, and had been refused. His honour held that as the books were exposed and the price marked upon them a purchaser was justified in merely buying one volume. If the defendants were entitled to the second shilling, they should have sued for it, and not have detained it. He gave a verdict for the amount claimed, with costs.

MR. O. Morgan, on Monday (for Sir H. Jackson), asked the Attorney-General whether his attention had been called to the alleged refusal of Mr. Baron Huddleston, at the Chelmsford Assizes, in the case of *Cave v. Mackenzie*, to try an issue of fact directed to be tried there by the Master of the Rolls, and Mr. Marten asked the Attorney-General whether his attention had been called to the observations of the Lord Chief Justice of England on Friday last in reference to the proposed trial at the Cambridge Assizes this week of an issue directed by the Master of the Rolls in the case of *The Local Board of Bishop Stortford v. Street and another*, and whether he was prepared to recommend any alteration of the law to prevent the difficulty which had arisen. The Attorney-General said—My attention has been called to the

case referred to in the first question. I imagine, however, there has been some misconception, or some degree of misconception, with respect to it. It appears to me, from statements which I have received, that Mr. Baron Huddleston did not decline to try the issues directed to be tried so much because he considered that, under the Judicature Acts and the rules made in pursuance of them, the Master of the Rolls had no power to direct that the trial should take place at Chelmsford, though he may have entertained some doubt on this subject, but because, owing to the state of business at the assizes, it was absolutely impossible to dispose of the issues alluded to without interfering most unduly with other causes standing for trial, and legitimately belonging to the Essex cause list. In reply to the second question, I have observed that quite recently—I think, on Friday last—the Lord Chief Justice announced his intention of trying certain issues directed by the Chancery Division of the High Court to be tried at the assizes if the state of business would admit of this course being pursued without injustice to other suitors. I think there is no necessity for any further legislation upon the matter. If any difficulty or inconvenience arises in consequence of causes being sent to the assizes for trial, such difficulty and inconvenience may be obviated by rules to be framed by the judges under the powers they already possess.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

July 20.—NULLUM TEMPUS (IRELAND).
This Bill was read a second time.

ELVER FISHING.
This Bill passed through committee.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (IRELAND).
This Bill passed through committee.

COMMONS.
This Bill was read a third time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD'S PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BATH, &c.).
This Bill was read a third time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD'S PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BILBROUGH, &c.).
This Bill was read a third time.

July 21.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

BANKERS' BOOKS EVIDENCE.
This Bill passed through committee.

NOTICES TO QUIT (IRELAND).
This Bill was read a second time.

ORPHAN AND DESERTED CHILDREN (IRELAND).
This Bill was read a second time.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.
This Bill was read a second time.

ELVER FISHING.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

PoOR LAW AMENDMENT.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

TRADE-MARKS REGISTRATION.
The Commons' amendments to this Bill were considered and agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD'S PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BIRMINGHAM, &c.).
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

July 24.—TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE.
This Bill was read a second time.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.
This Bill passed through committee.

NOTICES TO QUIT (IRELAND).
This Bill passed through committee.

NULLUM TEMPUS (IRELAND).
This Bill passed through committee.

MEDICAL ACT (QUALIFICATIONS).

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said its object was to enable every university or other body entitled under the Medical Act to grant qualifications for registration to grant such qualifications to all persons without distinction of sex. There was, however, a proviso that no woman should be entitled to take any part in the government, management, or proceeding of the universities or corporations mentioned in the said Medical Act.—The Bill was read a second time.

RIVERS.

The Duke of Buccleuch, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that its object was simply to prevent new pollutions of rivers.—The Bill was read a second time.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE.

This Bill passed through committee.

ORPHAN AND DESERTED CHILDREN (IRELAND).
This Bill passed through committee.

BANKERS' BOOKS EVIDENCE.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

July 20.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The House went into committee on this Bill.

The discussion was resumed upon the new clause, moved by Lord Sandon, called the poor districts clause, which amends the Education Act of 1870 as to the conditions of the annual parliamentary grant. The effect of the clause is that such grant shall not in any year exceed the amount of 17s. 6d. per child in average attendance at school during that year except by the sum by which the income of the school, derived from voluntary contributions, school fees, endowments, or any other source whatever other than the parliamentary grant, exceeds the said grant per child.—On a division the clause was read a second time by 185 to 100.—Lord E. FITZMAURICE moved to add the following subsection:—"If in any public elementary school the income arising from subscriptions or rates do not amount to at least one-sixth part of the total income of such school, there shall be deducted from the annual parliamentary grant payable to such school a sum equal in amount to the difference between the said one-sixth part of the total income of such school and the said income arising from subscriptions or rates."—On a division the amendment was rejected by 130 to 83.—The clause was added to the Bill.

Lord SANDON moved the insertion, after clause 24, of a clause authorizing the appointment, by the urban sanitary authority, of members of the school attendance committee, with the assent of the Education Department.—Lord F. HERVEY moved the insertion of words enabling the urban sanitary authority to make bye-laws without a requisition from the parish.—The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause was added to the Bill.

Lord SANDON moved a new clause, to be inserted after the 25th, to enable the Education Department to ask for certain returns from the local authorities.—The clause was read a second time and added to the Bill.

Mr. ONSLOW moved a clause giving power to the magistrates, if they should think fit, where a parent had been summoned for the non-attendance of his child at school, and had shown reasonable excuse, to grant such compensation as might cover the necessary expenses and loss of time, to be paid by the summoning officer.—The clause was negatived without a division.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE proposed to insert a clause, after clause 10, making provision for blind and deaf-mute children.—On a division the clause was rejected by 223 to 54.

Mr. MUNZT moved a new clause, to follow clause 10, providing that the expense incurred in establishing industrial schools might, with the consent of the Home Secretary, be spread over a term of years.—The clause was agreed to.

Mr. PELL moved two new clauses providing for the dissolution of School Boards where no school-house or site existed, and where the district had sufficient public school accommodation, and to make provision where School Boards possessed any property or had incurred any liability.—Progress was reported.

July 29, 1876.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

771

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

On the order of the day for resuming the adjourned debate on the second reading of this Bill, Sir C. DILKE moved the adjournment of the debate.—The motion was agreed to.

CATTLE DISEASES (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS LOANS.

This Bill was read a second time.

LINEN AND HEMP (IRELAND).

This Bill was withdrawn.

JURIES PROCEDURE (IRELAND).

The House went into committee *pro forma* on this Bill, in order that amendments might be inserted.

JULY 21.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The House went into committee on this Bill, resuming the discussion of the new clause proposed by Mr. Pell.—Progress was reported.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO.

This Bill was read a second time.

ARDGLASS HARBOUR.

This Bill passed through committee.

ERNE LOUGH AND RIVER.

This Bill passed through committee.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS LOANS.

This Bill passed through committee.

METROPOLIS (WHITECHAPEL AND LIMEHOUSE) IMPROVEMENTS SCHEME CONFIRMATION.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

JULY 24.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The House went into committee on this Bill and resumed the consideration of the new clause proposed by Mr. Pell, with reference to the dissolution of School Boards under certain circumstances.—On a division the clause was carried by 221 to 140.—Mr. FORSTER moved to amend the clause by inserting words limiting its operation to School Boards which had been voluntarily formed.—Progress was reported.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

This Bill was read a second time.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO.

The House went into committee on this Bill.

The first five clauses were agreed to, and progress was then reported.

CROSSED CHEQUES.

This Bill passed through committee.

JULY 25.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The House went into committee on this Bill, and considered the amendment proposed by Mr. W. E. FORSTER to insert in the amendment moved by Mr. Pell, "where a School Board has been formed under sub-section 1 of section 12 of 'The Elementary Education Act, 1870, and.'"—On a division the amendment was rejected by 172 to 115.—Mr. NOEL proposed as an amendment to Mr. Pell's new clause, after clause 21, line 2, after "by," leave out to "1870," and insert "nine-tenths of the ratepayers of the district."—The amendment was withdrawn.—The clause was then amended so as to require a majority of not less than two-thirds of those who should vote.—Mr. W. E. FORSTER moved the following amendment, to insert after "School Board" the following words:—"Where no requisition has been sent by the Education Department to such School Board, under section 10 of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, requiring them to supply public school accommodation."—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. W. E. FORSTER then moved to add after the amendment these words:—"And no action has been taken by such School Board under this Act or under the Elementary Act of 1870."—On a division, the amendment was rejected by 190 to 121.—Lord SANDON proposed an amendment of the clause, declaring that it should be the duty of the Department to take all the circumstances of the case into consideration, and decide whether the maintenance of a School Board was necessary.—The word "required" was substituted for "necessary," and the amendment was agreed to.—Mr. FAWCETT moved a proviso, line 9, after the word "Board,"

to the effect that it should not be lawful for the Education Department to consent to the abolition of any School Board which had passed bye-laws to secure the attendance of children at school.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 188 to 110.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

This Bill passed through committee, *pro forma*, and was ordered to be re-printed.

JULY 26.—BURIAL GROUNDS.

Mr. J. TALBOT moved the second reading of this Bill.—Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN moved that it be read a second time that day three months.—The Bill and amendment were ultimately withdrawn.

CRIMINAL LAW EVIDENCE AMENDMENT.

Mr. ASHLEY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said its object was to enable prisoners, their wives and husbands, and co-prisoners, their wives and husbands, to give evidence when on their trial on a criminal process.—Mr. RODWELL moved that the Bill be read a second time that day two months.—The Bill and amendment were withdrawn.

TRAINING SCHOOLS AND SHIPS.

This Bill was withdrawn.

MERCANTILE MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

This Bill was withdrawn.

VALUATION OF PROPERTY (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1869,**AMENDMENT.**

This Bill was withdrawn.

HOMICIDE LAW AMENDMENT.

The adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was resumed by Sir G. BOWYER, but the debate stood adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD'S PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BATH, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES.

The Lords' amendments to this Bill were considered and agreed to.

VALUATION.

This Bill was withdrawn.

WINTER ASSIZES.

This Bill passed through committee.

ARDGLASS HARBOUR.

This Bill was read a third time.

Court Papers.**HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.
CHANCERY DIVISION.****ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON**

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.
Monday, July 31	Mr. Milne	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday, Aug. 1	Merivale	Holdship
Wednesday .. 2	King	Farrer
Thursday 3	Merivale	Holdship
Friday 4	Milne	Holdship
Saturday 5	King	Farrer
V. C. MALINS. V. C. BAGEN.		V. C. HALL.
Monday, July 31	Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday, Aug. 1	Ward	Latham
Wednesday .. 2	Teesdale	Leach
Thursday 3	Ward	Latham
Friday 4	Teesdale	Leach
Saturday 5	Ward	Latham
Clowes		Clowes
Pemberton		Pemberton
Clowes		Clowes
Pemberton		Pemberton
Clowes		Clowes

PROBATE AND DIVORCE REGISTRIES.**VACATION 1876.****Taxation of Costs.**

The registrars of the Probate and Divorce registries of her Majesty's High Court of Justice will not tax any bill of costs after Tuesday, the 8th of August, until Thursday, the 2nd of November, except under special circumstances, to be stated in a written application addressed to them.

Summons.

On Wednesday, the 16th of August, and on every succeeding Wednesday until the 25th of October inclusive, one of the registrars will sit at the principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, to hear summonses, at twelve o'clock.

Motions.

On Wednesday, 16th and 30th of August, 13th and 27th of September, and 11th and 25th of October, one of the registrars will sit at the principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, to hear motions, at half-past twelve o'clock.

All papers for motions are to be left with the clerk of the papers and the chief clerk of the Divorce Registry, before two o'clock on the preceding Saturday.

Office Hours.

On and after the 10th of August, and until the 24th of October inclusive, the offices of the Probate and Divorce Registrars of the High Court of Justice will be opened to the public on Saturdays at ten o'clock a.m., and closed at two o'clock p.m., and on every other day of the week these offices will be opened at eleven o'clock a.m., and closed at three o'clock p.m.

Department for Literary Inquiry.

On and after the 10th of August, and until the 21st of September inclusive, this department will be entirely closed.

Payment of Money out of Court.

The registrars have fixed Friday in each week during the vacation for the payment of money out of court.

TRIAL OF CHANCERY ISSUES AT ASSIZES.

In answer to a question by Lord Selborne on Thursday in the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor read the following letter from the Lord Chief Justice:—

"South-Eastern Circuit, July 22.

"Dear Lord Chancellor.—The postponement by Baron Huddleston, at the recent Chelmsford Assizes, of the trial of an issue sent down for trial by the Master of the Rolls having given rise to observations in the public papers, as so often happens on an imperfect apprehension of the facts, and notice having been given of a question to be put in the House of Lords on the subject by Lord Selborne, I think it desirable that you should be put in possession of the exact facts of the case.

"Being desirous of remaining as long as possible to assist in doing the work of our courts in town, and not anticipating more than the average run of business on the circuit, Baron Huddleston and I, the judges of assize on this circuit, had allowed only the usual time at the different circuit towns. On arriving at Chelmsford we found the business on the civil side apparently much heavier than we had expected, and Baron Huddleston, who sat on the civil side, was informed that this issue, sent down by the Master of the Rolls for trial, would occupy fully three days; in other words, the whole time at the assizes; so that if tried, as it stood early in the list, it would lead to all the other causes being made *remandees*. Baron Huddleston consulted me, and, as it did not appear that there had been any special ground for sending this issue to be tried at Chelmsford, but, on the contrary, it might just as well have been tried by a jury before the Master of the Rolls himself—indeed, we were informed that the Master of the Rolls had at first refused to order a trial by jury, but, on being applied to a second time, had consented to grant a jury, but, declining to try it himself, had said he should send it to Chelmsford—I, under the circumstances, advised my learned colleague not to let the trial of this issue displace and supersede the proper local business of the assize, but to treat it as the last case in the list, which was done accordingly. It so happened that, having finished the criminal business, I was fortunately able to come to the assistance of my brother judge, and one or two of the causes, which threatened to be heavy, having been unexpectedly settled, we were enabled to finish the business of the assize in time, without leaving any *remandees*. If the issue had been tried this would have been impossible. If any responsibility attaches to the course thus

pursued I desire to share it, as my learned colleague, though fully concurring in my view, acted under my advice. I am still, on the fullest consideration, of opinion that the course taken was, under the circumstances, the right one. I think it right to add that I further suggested to Baron Huddleston that we should take the first opportunity of your lordship, as President of the High Court, calling its members together to bring the whole subject of issues sent from the equity division to the common law divisions, or circuits, to be tried by juries, under the consideration of the High Court, it being my very decided opinion that the course which the equity judges are understood to be pursuing, of sending all issues of fact calling for trial by a jury to be tried at *Nisi Prius* by a judge of a common law division, is altogether in excess of the power conferred by ord. 19 [sic] of the rules of court, as well as contrary to the entire spirit of recent legislation in the matter of judicature."

The Lord Chancellor also read the following letter from Mr. Baron Huddleston:—

"The civil business at Chelmsford was unusually and unexpectedly heavy, and there were only two days and part of a third (the commission day at Hertford) in which to do the whole of the work, both civil and criminal. While trying the first common jury some application was made to me with reference to the special juries, and I was informed by the counsel engaged in *Cave v. Mackenzie*, which stood third in the list, that it had been sent to Chelmsford by the Master of the Rolls, who, though applied to, had refused to try it himself with a jury; that it was a matter arising entirely in the Chancery Division of the High Court, and in no way connected with the county of Essex, and, if tried, would occupy at least three days.

"I consulted with the Lord Chief Justice, and we came to the conclusion that I ought not to give it precedence over the other causes or try it at these assizes to the prejudice of the business legitimately belonging to the Essex cause list. In announcing this to the bar I stated that the Lord Chief Justice and myself both thought that, considering the spirit of the Judicature Acts and the intention of the Legislature to fuse law and equity, as we in the common law divisions of the High Court had to deal and did deal with all questions of equity that came before us, the equity judges, having every facility afforded them to do so, might well try, with the assistance of a jury, any question of fact which arose before them, and not send it to the assizes or the courts of common law [sic], already overwhelmed with the pressure of their own business.

"I did not make the cause a *remandee*, as I might have done (it being impossible to try it within the compass of the time allotted to the assizes), because I did not think it right by so doing to throw on any brother judge who might go the spring circuit the duty of trying it. But the Lord Chief Justice and myself agreed that the opinion of the judges of the High Court should be obtained on the subject at their first meeting.

"If, in their judgment, the cause ought to be tried by a common law judge, I intend, if the parties desire it and the Master of the Rolls will vary his order to that effect, to try it myself in London or Middlesex with a special jury, and thus spare the parties the delay till March, and save them the extra expense of taking it down again to Chelmsford."

The Lord Chancellor, after reading these letters, stated the provisions of the Acts and rules relating to the matter, and added that "these were the provisions which bore on the point. They seemed to take a large and comprehensive view. The power given was like every other power subject to discretion, and it was better he should say nothing on that point. But whatever might be the principle on which that discretion ought to be exercised, their lordships would agree with him that, once a case was sent down by a judge who had the power to send it down, there ought not to be at the assizes any investigation of the principle on which the case was sent down. The suitors, in order to go to trial, would be put to considerable expense; they had their witnesses ready and their counsel, and then, if the question was to be raised as to whether it was a discreet and proper thing to send the case down, the persons who would suffer by the raising of that question would be the suitors."

July 29, 1876.

PRISONERS' EVIDENCE.

In the course of the debate on the Criminal Law Evidence Amendment Bill, Mr. Russell Gurney said:—Having been brought up to the profession almost from a child, he had been favourable to the institutions and practices that he found in existence; but his experience had convinced him that it was most important for the interests of justice, for the conviction of the guilty and the acquittal of the innocent—that some such change as was now proposed should be made in the law of this country. Wives now could not be examined where their husbands were concerned, or husbands for their wives, and nothing more absurd could be conceived. Very often the only person who could prove a man's innocence was the wife, especially as to events which were alleged to have occurred at night. If the accused husband were a good, moral man and lived with his wife, her mouth was closed, but if he were an immoral man and lived with a mistress she could be examined in his defence. Opinions quite as strong as had been expressed against this Bill had been urged against allowing the parties interested in civil suits to give evidence. He had lately been reading the "Memoir of Lord Althorp," in which it was stated that this nobleman brought forward a Small Debts Bill in which he proposed to give power to the parties to be examined. An old judge said of this proposal that it was most barbarous and abhorrent, and that nothing would result from it but unmitigated perjury. But the change had been made, and what had been the result? No person who practised in our courts wished to return to the old system. No doubt, perjury was occasionally committed, yet the alteration in the law had tended most materially to the elucidation of truth. Justice was more speedily and more certainly arrived at, and under the species of compulsion that now existed the defendant was often obliged to admit the debt that he disputed. But we had gone rather further than altering the law in mere civil actions. When the divorce courts were established there were universal complaints from women that their mouths were closed in matters of supreme importance to them. That was felt to be a great hardship, and by universal consent the parties to a suit were allowed to be examined. Perjury was no doubt committed, but the truth was more clearly arrived at. He now asked for the same relief for the innocent prisoner who stood at the bar charged with some criminal offence, and he could not say as a judge in criminal cases that the change was unnecessary. He had often felt when he entertained doubts about a case that those doubts would be entirely removed if he could put six questions to the prisoner. In two cases of forgery which had occurred before him, women had been called whose evidence could not have been received if they had been the wives of the prisoners. One woman told the truth, and most reluctantly established the case on the part of the prosecution. The prisoner was accordingly convicted, but if she had been married to the prisoner he would wrongly have been acquitted because her mouth would have been stopped. The other woman was not called by the prosecution, but her evidence in the prisoner's favour soon broke down on cross-examination, and her statement having been found to be untrue the prisoner was in that case also convicted. If those women had been the wives of the prisoners, application would have been made to the Home Office for the release of the prisoners upon the affidavits of those women, and when they were referred to him for his report he might have found it very difficult to come to the conclusion which he had arrived at without hesitation when the women were examined in open court. The opinion he now expressed had been, in fact, forced upon him by what he had seen in the English courts. During the period, little short of two years, which he recently spent in the United States he lost no opportunity of visiting the criminal courts to see the working of this system. He heard several trials in which the prisoners were examined, and in every case their evidence tended to the elucidation of the truth. He was specially struck by the manner in which this system worked for the deliverance of the innocent. He was present at one trial where the prisoner admitted that he had been previously convicted, and of the same sort of offence. He gave, however, as a witness, such a complete explanation of all the circumstances against him, and his evidence was so completely confirmed, that he was at once acquitted by the jury.

He might go further than his own experience, because he lost no opportunity of asking the opinion of the judges and the prosecuting officers, and one and all agreed that the change had been an improvement. The Chief Justice of Maine stated that the new system had worked admirably, and had given great satisfaction to the judge, the bar, and the public. Innocent men were able to give important evidence in their own defence, and the Chief Justice said he regarded the change as absolutely indispensable to the due administration of the law. The district prosecuting attorneys described the change as having assisted greatly in bringing the guilty to punishment, while the innocent might rejoice in the opportunity thus afforded of proving their innocence. The prosecuting attorney for the district of New York stated that the bench and the bar were once all opposed to the change, but they were now unanimous in its favour. This officer told him that in seven cases in which he had conducted the prosecution he had, after hearing the explanation of the prisoner, thrown up the case. Unless it could be alleged that our judges were unfit for their high offices, he had no fear of any change in their manner or demeanour as a consequence of the change now proposed.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
PARLIAMENTARY AGENTS.

THE following is the report of the select committee appointed by the House of Lords and the House of Commons to consider the expediency of making further regulations concerning the admission and practice of parliamentary agents, and to report their opinion thereon.

The committees have met, and having jointly considered the matter referred to them, and taken evidence thereupon, have agreed to the following report, viz.—

1. Before the year 1836 the whole of the private business of Parliament was conducted by officers of the two Houses. In that year the House of Commons passed a resolution requiring those of their officers who had been in the habit of conducting private business through Parliament to elect whether they would retain their offices, confining themselves to their public duties, or would retire with a view to practising outside the House as parliamentary agents in the present sense of the term.

2. Several of the officers elected to retire, and in course of time established firms by whose representatives the greater part of the private business of each session has, up to the present time, been conducted.

3. Since the year 1836 any person has been allowed to practise as a parliamentary agent in the House of Lords, and no provisions have been made by that House for the admission or conduct of parliamentary agents. In the House of Commons certain rules have been made and revised from time to time. Those now in force were sanctioned by the Speaker on the 7th of March, 1873, and will be found in the appendix to this report.

4. The committee are of opinion that the practice observed since 1836 has, in several instances, failed to secure such efficiency on the part of parliamentary agents in the discharge of their duties towards their clients and towards Parliament as might reasonably be required.

5. The profession of a parliamentary agent requires an accurate acquaintance with particular branches of the law, and especially with the practice of Parliament; also a sound knowledge of parliamentary drafting. It is at least as distinct from those of a barrister and a solicitor as those two professions are from each other, and several excellent agents have not belonged to either. The committee are therefore not prepared to recommend that barristers and solicitors should be exclusively eligible to become parliamentary agents, as their training does not afford in itself proof of special qualification, and they are of opinion that fitness for the office should (except in the case of those now in actual practice) be tested by a special examination, of such a character as to admit persons thoroughly qualified for actual practice.

6. The committee recommend that the names of all persons authorized to practise as parliamentary agents be entered on a roll to be kept by the Clerk of the Parliaments, and published once a year towards the close of the session, together with the rules for the time being regulating the admission and practice of agents.

July 29, 1876.

7. The committee recommend that the roll comprise, in the first instance, the names of all persons who, during this or the preceding Parliament, have introduced and conducted any private Bill through both Houses, and of such other persons, if any, as the chairman of committees of the House of Lords and the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have, for special reasons, considered entitled to be placed on it.

8. That in the roll of parliamentary agents no one shall be entered as a member of a firm or partnership who is not a duly qualified agent, and that all Bills hereafter introduced by any firm or partnership be marked by the name of the responsible agent in addition to the name of the firm or partnership.

9. The committee recommend that in future no person be allowed to act as agent for the introduction or conduct of a private Bill in either House of Parliament unless his name is on the roll of parliamentary agents, but that any person whether on the roll or not may conduct the opposition to any such Bill on entering into such engagements as may be required by the rules mentioned in section 15.

10. That any barrister, advocate, solicitor, writer to the signet, or graduate of any university in the United Kingdom, and also any person who shall have passed such a general examination, to be conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners, as shall be directed by the chairman of committees and the Speaker, shall be allowed to present himself as a candidate for the special examination.

11. That the special examination be conducted by examiners to be named from time to time for every such examination by the chairman of committees and by the Speaker, and be directed to ascertain the fitness of the candidates for immediate practice as parliamentary agents.

12. That any candidate who has passed the special examination may apply to the chairman of committees and the Speaker to have his name entered on the roll; and if they are satisfied that he is in all respects a fit and proper person to be appointed a parliamentary agent, the Clerk of the Parliaments shall enter his name on the roll.

13. That any agent may be struck off the roll by the chairman of committees and the Speaker, for neglect of rules, or professional misconduct of any kind.

14. That no person who has been prohibited from practising as a parliamentary agent, or struck off the roll of solicitors, or advocates, or writers to the signet, or disbarred by any of the Inns of Court, be allowed to be enrolled as a parliamentary agent.

15. That special rules for regulating the admission and practice of parliamentary agents and other persons in either House be drawn up by the chairman of committees and the Speaker, with power to vary the same.

16. That it is desirable that such special rules forbid altogether any division of the charges of a parliamentary agent, and that provision be made for the summary removal from the roll of the name of any agent of whose breach of this rule the chairman and Speaker shall be satisfied.

17. That the taxing officer of either House be instructed to report to the chairman of committees and the Speaker the bill of costs of any agent which he may deem to contain improper or exorbitant charges.

18. The committee, in suggesting the manner in which the roll should be formed at first, desire to give the fullest protection to what may possibly be considered as existing rights. With a roll so formed, they do not consider that all incompetent agents will be at once excluded from practice, but they believe that the adoption of the recommendations of this report will of itself have a salutary effect, and that before long the roll will be confined to agents who may be trusted to conduct the private business with advantage to Parliament, and with efficiency and economy as regards their clients. From the evidence given before the committee, it will be seen how much risk there is, both to the public and to clients, when Bills are prepared and conducted by incompetent agents.

19. The committee desire to add that the resemblance between private Bills and provisional orders, and provisional certificates is so close, and the importance of uniformity so great, that the expediency of restricting the conduct of all such proceedings to the same class of practitioners is deserving of serious consideration.

July 17, 1876.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

July 28, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 90 <i>½</i>	Annuities, April, '75, 9 <i>½</i>
Ditto for Account, Aug 2, '76	Do, (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 96 <i>½</i>	Ex Bills, £1000, 2 <i>½</i> per Cts. 20 pm
New 3 per Cent., 96 <i>½</i>	Ditto, £500, Do, 20 pm.
Do, 3 <i>½</i> per Cent., Jan., '74	Ditto, £100 & £300, 20 pm.
Do, 3 <i>½</i> per Cent., Jan., '74	Bank of England Stock, — per Cts. (last half-year), 250
Do, 3 per Cent., Jan., '73	Ditto for Account.
Annuities, Jan., '72	

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 10 <i>½</i>	Ditto, 3 <i>½</i> per Cent., May, '75, 8 <i>½</i>
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent., April, '64
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct., '88, 10 <i>½</i>	Do, 5 per C. nt., Aug. '73
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
Ditto Enforced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 80	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
2nd Enf. Fr., 5 per C., Jan., '72	

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	180	
Stock Caledonian	100	124 <i>½</i>	
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	109	
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	45 <i>½</i>	
Stock Great Northern	100	132	
Stock Do., A Stock*	100	136 <i>½</i>	
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—	
Stock Great Western—Original	100	110 <i>½</i>	
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	131	
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	118 <i>½</i>	
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	23 <i>½</i>	
Stock London and North-Western	100	147 <i>½</i>	
Stock London and South-Western	100	130 <i>½</i>	
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	71 <i>½</i> x d	
Stock Metropolitan	100	104 x d	
Stock Do., District	100	49	
Stock Midland	100	130 <i>½</i>	
Stock North British	100	98 <i>½</i>	
Stock North Eastern	100	158	
Stock North London	100	132	
Stock North Staffordshire	100	64	
Stock South Devon	100	68	
Stock South-Eastern	100	129 x d	

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

There is no alteration to report this week; the reserve keeps steadily increasing, and is now 57*½* per cent. of the liabilities. In the foreign stock market prices have improved, but there has not been much business doing owing to the settlement of the account. Home railways have again advanced this week, the rise in the Scotch lines and Great Western amounting to nearly 5 per cent. Consols closed at 96*½* to 96*¾* for money and account.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

GIBSON—July 23, at Berkeley Lodge, Shoot-up-hill, Cricklewood, the wife of Jasper Gibson, of 64, Lincoln's-inn-fields, solicitor, of a daughter.

DEATH.

BEGBIE—July 25, at his residence, 8, New Ormond-street, W.C., Charles Begbie, solicitor, youngest son of the late Alexander Begbie, Commissary-General of the Bahamas, aged 72.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Wakefield Grand United Odd Fellows Friendly Loan Society.—V.C. Malins has fixed Monday, July 31, at 12, at his chambers, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Gas Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 15, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on July 29. Wilkins and Blyth, St. Swithin's-lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

Probate Insurance Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated July 13, appointed Lewis Henry Evans, Coleman st., to be official liquidator.

Railway and General Light Improvement Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 17, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 29. Keighley and Co., Philpot-lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

July 29, 1876.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

775

Tirmanor Coal, Iron, and Steel Company, Limited.—The M.R. has by an order dated May 12, appointed Thomas Dennis Rock, Leaderhall st., to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Sept 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, Oct 31, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASter.

Liverpool Finance and Estate Agency Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 17, directed to be heard before the V.C., at St George's Hall, Liverpool, on Aug 12. Mather, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, July 25, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Canary Islands and Morocco Steam Ship Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated July 15, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Lowless and Co, Martin's Lane, Cannon st., solicitors for the petitioners. City of London Supply Association and Clerks' Club, Limited.—V.C. Hall has fixed Aug 2, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Cornwall Chemical Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Aug 2. Crook and Smith, Fenchurch st., solicitors for the petitioner.

Crown Fire Insurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on Aug 4. Silberberg, petitioner in person.

Imperial Brazilian Collieries, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 15, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Webb, Queen Victoria st., solicitor for the petitioner.

Jamison Graving Dock Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Wednesday, Aug 2, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Sheffield Laundry Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 15, it was ordered that the above company should be wound up. Tarr and Co, Bedford row, agents for Wells and Hind, Nottingham, solicitors for the petitioners. Welsh Iron Works Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 24, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Aug 5. Allin and Greenop, St Peter's alley, Cornhill, solicitors for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF DEVON.

Girt and Holston Downs Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the Vice-Warden, dated July 15, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Dobell, jun., Truro, agent for Chaterton, Ludgate hill, solicitor for the petitioner.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

Clapham Friendly Society, Lord Raglan, Wandsworth rd, Clapham, Surrey. July 20.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

Brown, John, Woodford, Essex, Esq. Oct 10. Elbank v Brown, V.C. Malins. Farmer, Pancras Lane, Chapside Young, John, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Butcher. Sept 1. Earle v Young, V.C. Malins. Newby, Stockton Barvey, Thomas, St Clement's House, Clement's Lane, Gent. Sept 30. Dominion of Canada Oils Refinery Company, Limited v Harvey. V.C. Malins. Davies, Moorgate st.

TUESDAY, July 25, 1876.

Featherstone, Elizabeth, Crook, Durham, Sept 5. Blackett v Blackett, M.R. Chapman, Durham. Greenwood, Thomas, Leeds, Shopkeeper. Sept 6. Shackleton v Pickard, M.R. Appleton, Leeds Martin, Anna, Plymouth, Devon. Oct 10. Gruzelier v Weary, V.C. Hall, Edmonds, Plymouth Nicholson, William, Thorpe-le-Soken, Essex. Oct 2. Nicholson v Nicholson, V.C. Bacon. Books, King st, Chapside

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Glanville, George, Goldsmith st, Silk Merchant. Pet July 18. Keene, Aug 9 at 11. Tucker, George, Seabright st, Bethnal Green rd, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Pet July 19. Keene, Aug 2 at 1. Videon, George, Fletcher, Maude Vale, Florist. Pet July 19. Keene, Aug 9 at 11. Veale, John, Swain's Lane, Highgate, Mason. Pet July 18. Keene, Aug 9 at 12.

To Surrender in the Country.

Bennard, William, Hastings, Sussex, Electro Plater. Pet July 18. Young, Hastings, Aug 2 at 12. Daubly, Frederick, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Commission Agent. Pet to 14. Postlethwaite, Barrow-in-Furness, Aug 4 at 12 Drayton, Edward, and William Drayton, Liverpool, Nut Makers. Pet July 16. Bellringer, Liverpool, Aug 3 at 11. Ranson, Samuel, Gunthorpe, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Pet July 17. Patchett, Nottingham, Aug 2 at 10.30 Worrell, Thomas, Folkestone, Kent, Butcher. Pet July 17. Furley, Canterbury, Aug 4 at 2

TUESDAY, July 25, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Kington, Charles, Sanders terrace, Blake's rd, Peckham, Jeweller. Pet July 21. Keene, Aug 9 at 12. Nash, James, Sideworth st, Hackney, Builder. Pet July 22. Murray, Aug 9 at 12. Thompson, The mas, Euston rd, Grocer. Pet July 22. Murray, Aug 11 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Anderson, William, Liverpool, Newspaper Proprietor. Pet July 20. Bellringer, Liverpool, Aug 8 at 11.

Edwards, Francis, Brynmawr, Brecon, Innkeeper. Pet July 20. Shepard, Tredegar, Aug 8 at 11.

Leete, William Waples, Manchester, Chemist. Pet July 21. Lister, Manchester, Aug 10 at 9.30.

Loewenstein, Max, Bradford, York, Stuf Merchant. Pet July 21. Robinson, Bradford, Aug 8 at 9.

Martin, W. G., Uxbridge, Middlesex, Tea Dealer. Pet July 15. Darvil, Windsor, Aug 12 at 12.

Rees, David, Pencau, Taliesin, Cardigan. Pet July 20. Jenkins, Aberystwyth, Aug 8 at 12.

Rowlands, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Wholesale Fruiterer. Pet July 20. Bradshaw, Newcastle, Aug 9 at 12.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

Bennett, Edward, Kedlington, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. July 14 Gee, William Henry, Nottingham, Elastic Web Merchant. July 11 Pritchard, Philip, Great St Helen's, Bishopsgate st, Merchant. July 17

TURED, July 25, 1876.

Coote, John, Leeds, Merchant. July 13 Gurr, Jonathan, Frederick st, Gray's inn rd. July 20 Overton, Arthur, Cambridge, Currier. July 19

Sherrott, Augustus John, Horsham, Sussex, Farmer. July 21

Liquidation by Arrangement.**FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, July 21, 1876.

Anthony, David, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Draper. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Howell, Stepney st, Llanelli

Arnold, Richard, Sergeant, known as George Robert Arnold, Tyroes, Anglesea, Licensed Victualler. Aug 8 at 13 at the Alexandra Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool, Allanson, Carnarvon

Aveyard, William, George Aveyard, and Joseph Aveyard, Manchester, Cotton Doublers. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester

Backhouse, Alfred, Charles Foster, George Caff Travis, and James Edward Foster, Halifax, York, Stock Brokers. Aug 8 at 1 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Norris and Co, Halifax Bates, Samuel, Halifax, York, Tailor. July 31 at 11 at offices of Leeming, George st, Halifax

Belcher, Isaac, Birmingham, Dealer in Jewellery. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Davies, Bennett's Hill, Birmingham Blakemore, John, and Alfred Blakemore, Leamington Priory, Warwick, Upholsterers. Aug 1 at 12 at offices of Field, Warwick st, Leamington

Boodle, Alfred William, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Solicitor. Aug 5 at 10 at offices of Pruen, Regent st, Cheltenham Brightman, Richard, Luton, Bedford, Nurseryman. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Newe, Park st, west, Luton Bushnell, Henry Gains, Birmingham, Baker. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Sagnall, Colmore row, Birmingham

Carter, Alfred, Sheffield, Cabinet Maker. Aug 4 at 4 at offices of Gee, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield. Binn, Sheldfield Chirm, Thomas, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Musician. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Smith and Co, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil

Clements, Henry Lincoln, High Holborn, Upholsterer. Aug 3 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Lumley and Lumley, Old Jewry chambers

Cook, Thomas, Queen Elizabeth st, Horsleydown, Glass Cutter. July 29 at 2 at 37, Bedford row. Marshall Cordwell, William, Thomas, Birdham, nr Chichester, Sussex, Silversmith. Aug 19 at 2 at offices of Dillon-Webb and Kelly, Chancery lane

Coward, James, Lyon terrace, Seven Sisters' rd, Holloway, Skirt Manufacturer. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Lovering and Co, Gresham st, Buckler, Queen Victoria st

Crossland, Joe, Wakefield, York, Provision Dealer. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Lake, Southgate, Wakefield Davies, William, Tony Paudy, Rhonda Valley, Glamorgan, Ironmonger. Aug 4 at 12.30 at offices of Simons and Plews, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Devanish, Samuel George, Champion grove, Denmark hill, Camberwell, Commercial Clerk. July 31 at 2 at offices of Gowing and Mandale, King st, Cheapside

Dexter, John Leake, and Walter Shropshire Shepherd, Bourne End, Buckingham, Engineers. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Dod and Longstaffe, Berners st

Dorber, William, Salford, Lancashire, Coach Builder. Aug 11 at 11 at offices of Farrar and Hall, Princeps st, Manchester

Dunn, Frederick, Market Rasen, Lincoln, Boot Maker. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Page and Padley, Market Rasen

Durham, James, Jun., Sudbury, Suffolk, Cabinet Maker. Aug 4 at 2 at offices of Gamble and Harvey, Gresham buildings, Basingstoke st, Lockyer

Easley, Edwin Saint, Frizinghall, nr Bradford, York, Coal Merchant. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford

Evans, Evan, Wan View, Elanbeck, Carnarvon, Tailor. Aug 2 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester. James, Tyndyfwr, Llanrwst Fisher, Anthony, Stafford, Watch Maker. July 29 at 11 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Foreman, Robert, Jun., Shoreham, Kent, Baker. Aug 2 at 12 at offices of Holcroft and Co, London rd, Sevenoaks

Foster, Charles Noah, New Wharf, Whitefriars, Builder. Aug 3 at 12 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st, Burton

Freeman, Samuel Cooper, Somersham, Huntington, Grocer. Aug 4 at 12 at offices of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peterborough German, Alfred, Portsmouth, Hants, Merchant's Clerk and Ironfounder. Aug 3 at 4 at offices of Ford, Portsdown

Gibson, William, jun., High st, Camden town, Fishmonger. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Heathfield and Son, Lincoln's Inn fields

Grainger, Robert, Manchester, Painter. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Ritson and Grundy, Cross st, Manchester Griffiths, George, Landore, nr Swansea, Glamorgan, Draper. July 31 at 11 at offices of the Home Trade Association, York st, Manchester Cox

Gunn, Robert Edward, Southgate, Middlesex, Florist. July 21 at 12 at offices of Smith, Great James st, Bedford row

Hall, John, Whitechapel rd, Draper. Aug 3 at 11 at 111, Cheapside.
 Cox and Sons
 Hart, William, Austrey, Warwick, Saddler. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Nevill and Atkins, George st, Tamworth
 Hearn, Rufus George, East Stonehouse, Devon, Ironmonger. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Elworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth
 Hewitt, Charles Cullwick, Dudley, Worcester, Wine Merchant. Aug 2 at 2 at offices of Angell and Inbert-Terry, Gresham st, Bank
 Hicklin, William, Walsall, Stafford, Painter. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury
 Hill, Thomas, Jun, Leicester, Boot Dealer. Aug 2 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne buildings, Millstone lane, Leicester
 Histon, Abel, Smethwick, Stafford, Boot Dealer. Aug 1 at 10 at offices of Solomon, Ann st, Birmingham
 Hedges, Francis, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. July 26 at 11 at offices of Tree, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester
 Holinrake, James, Hopwood, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Anderson, Garden st, Bury
 Hood, Kenneth, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Hatter. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Smith, Cork's buildings, Preeson's row, Liverpool
 Hornsey, George, Water lane, Lighterman. July 31 at 2 at Kennan's Hotel, Crown court, Cheapside
 Horsey, Henry, Bermondsey New rd, Bermondsey, Beer Retailer. July 29 at 3 at 30, Camberwell green, Old, Trinity st, Southwark
 Hyams, John, Lancashire court, New Bond st, General Dealer. July 29 at 4, at 3, Featherstone buildings, Bedford row, Hope
 Jacobs, Solomon, Manchester, General Dealer. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Eltoft, King st, Manchester
 Jones, Rhoda, Eliza, Mawern Link, Worcester, Schoolmistress. July 31 at 11 at the Belle Vue Hotel, Great Mawern. Miller, Worcester
 Kemp, John, Linton, Cambridge, Tailor. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Ellison and Burrows, Alexandra st, Cambridge
 Kershaw, John Hugh, Bingley, York, Chemist. Aug 2 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Halliak, Buxton
 Kirby, Thomas, Jun, and Joseph Chadwick, Leeds, Iron Merchants. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Turner, East Parade, Leeds
 Lyons, Samuel, Manchester, Boot Maker. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Minor, Brown st, Manchester
 Lane, Joseph George, Alma terrace, Prospect place, Bethnal Green, Engineer. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Harling, Fleet st
 Linley, Samuel, Leeds, The Plate Worker. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Cooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds
 Liverstoke, William, New rd, South Norwood, Nurseryman. Aug 1 at 2 at 22, Martin's lane, Cannon st, Hogan and Hughes
 Markerow, Edward William, Cleethorpes, Lincoln, Snack Owner. Aug 9 at 11 at offices of Grange and Wintringham, St Mary's gate, Great Grimaby
 Moran, John Wainwright, sen, Deptford, Kent, Boot Maker. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Marchant and Purvis, George yard, Lombard st
 Neil, John, and Edward George Robert Hughes, Manchester, Stationers. Aug 9 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester, Storer, Manchester
 Nield, Harry, Stockport, Cheshire, Joiner. Aug 8 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
 Pearman, Edwin, Little Guildford st, Iron Bedstead Manufacturer. Aug 6 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Colis, Stourbridge
 Peters, William Paul, Liverpool, Corn Merchant. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool
 Pope, George James, Norwich, Plumber. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Miller and Co, Bank chambers, Norwich
 Radford, John, Wood Farm, Devon, Farmer. Aug 4 at 3.30 at offices of Daws, jun, City Chambers, Gandy st, Exeter. Partridge Read, Walter John, Bath, Cabinet Maker. Aug 4 at 12 at offices of Ricketts, Paragon, Bath
 Reynolds, James, Briony, Glamorgan, Grocer. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Smith and Co, Somerset place, Swansea
 Roberts, David, Rhyd, Flint, Coal Merchant. Aug 7 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester, Gee, Liverpool
 Robinson, Robert, Bradford, Mineral Waters Manufacturer. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Wilkinson, Kirkgate, Bradford
 Rose, Edward, Staplehurst, Kent, Harness Maker. Aug 4 at 12 at offices of Monckton and King, King st, Maidstone
 Rusty, William Henry, Maidstone, Kent, Draper. Aug 3 at 2 at offices of Surt, Ironmonger lane
 Saunders, Henry Eleazar, and Josiah William Saunders, Birmingham, Brassfounders. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Bagnull, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Seeling, John, Bevin Marks, Hat Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 5 at offices of Green, Queen st, Cheapside
 Servant, Thomas, West Hartlepool, Darham, Grocer. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hartlepool
 Silvester, John, Ystrad, nr Pontypriod, Glamorgan, Builder. Aug 3 at 12.30 at offices of Simons and Pews, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil
 Simon, George, Leicester, Shoe Manufacturer. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicestershire
 Smith, Charles Westbury, Wilts, Land Agent. Aug 9 at 12 at the Lopen Arms Hotel, Westbury, Pinner
 Stevens, William Henry, Market Harborough, Leicester, Coach Builder. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Owston, Ffar lane, Leicester
 Sunderland, Alfred, Bradford, York, Commission Wool Comber. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Lee and Co, New Investor, Bradford
 Thomas, George, Kensington park rd, Ironmonger. Aug 1 at 10 at Ridder's Hotel, Holborn, Yorke, Marylebone rd
 Thompson, George Frederick, Camberwell rd, Printer. July 28 at 2 at offices of Howe, Staple Inn, Holborn. Morris, Staple Inn, Holborn
 Turner, Elijah, Dewsbury, York, Tailor. Aug 7 at 2.30 at offices of Stapleton, Union st, Dewsbury
 Turner, Frederick William, Cromer st, Gray's inn rd, Olmian. Aug 8 at 12 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Roberts, Clement's inn, Strand
 Upton, William George, Southport, Lancashire, Plumber. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Walton, Town Hall, Southport
 Walker, Charles, Bradford, York, Worsted Spinner. Aug 9 at 11 at St George's Hall, Bradford. Gardiner, Bradford
 Waters, Charles, Fordingbridge, Hants, Undertaker. Aug 2 at 2 at the Three Swan Hotel, Salisbury. Guy, Southampton
 Watmough, Harry, jun, Leeds, Machine Dealer. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Thomas and Co, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Leeds, Ellington
 Whitehall, Louis, Woodville, Leicester, Innkeeper. July 31 at 11 at the Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton-on-Trent. Wilson, Burton, on-Trent
 Whitehead, James, Skipton, York, Boot Maker. Aug 9 at 3 at the Crown Hotel, Celine, Hartley, Burnley
 Wilburn, Edgar, Doncaster, York, Livery Stable Keeper. Aug 2 at 12 at offices of Peagam, Baxter gate, Doncaster
 Williams, Henry, St Day, Cornwall, Draper. Aug 8 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Exeter. Beckingham, Bristol
 Williams, Robert, Manchester, Embosser. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Hinde and Co, Mount st, Manchester
 Williams, William Maurice, Malden rd, Kentish town, Tobacconist. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Barkeley, Marylebone
 Williams, George, and Charles Galloway, Leeds, Butchers. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Pullam, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
 Wilshaw, James Moore, Billington, Lancashire, Travelling Draper. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Marriott, Northgate, Blackburn
 Wood, John, Banstead, Surrey, Timber Merchant. Aug 2 at 2 at offices of Morten and Cutler, Newgate at
 Yarnall, Alfred Richard, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Safety Lamp Maker. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Maundy place, Aberdare

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1876.

Ablett, Frederick John, Addle st, Wood st, Manufacturer. Aug 9 at 2 at offices of Phelps and Sidwick, Gresham st
 Balmforth, George, jun, and William Balmforth, Leeds, Leather Merchants. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Middleton and Sons, Park row, Leeds
 Barnes, John, Middlesborough, York, Grocer. Aug 7 at 3 at Griffith's Temperance Hotel, Linthorpe rd, Middlesborough. Balsbridge, Middlesborough
 Barnes, James, Rychnoy, Monmouth, Greengrocer. Aug 7 at 11 at offices of Harris, Morgan st, Tredegar
 Beesley, Edward, Birmingham, Baker. Aug 8 at 2 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Bennett, Benjamin, Swanset, Glamorgan, Boot Maker. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Smith and Co, Somerset place, Swanset
 Blake, James, Plumstead, Kent, Builder. Aug 5 at 2 at the Anti-Gallican Tavern, New Charlton. Marshall, Bedford row
 Blackemore, John, and Alfred Blackemore, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Upholsterers. Aug 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, in lieu of the place originally named
 Bonaphray, Matthias, and George Parker Wilson, Liverpool, General Brokers. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Commerce court, Lerd st, Liverpool
 Bradie, Henry Phelps, Stoke Newington rd, Tailor. Aug 3 at 2 at offices of Bellgrave, Somerford grove, Stoke Newington
 Bradshaw, Frederick, Derby, Painter. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Gretton, Corn market, Derby
 Branman, Walter Chorley, Taunton, Somerset, Auctioneer. Aug 8 at 11 at 10, Hammett st, Taunton, Trentham, Taunton
 Bridge, Christopher, Dunkindfield, Cheshire, Wheatsheaf. Aug 7 at 3 at the Commercial Inn, Brown st, Manchester. Whitehead, Stalybridge
 Bridge, Henry, Southport, Lancashire, Basket Manufacturer. Aug 8 at 2 at offices of Barker, London st, Southport
 Buckley, Joseph, Lincoln, Commission Agent. Aug 9 at 11 at offices of Page, jun, Flaxengate, Lincoln
 Bundy, Edward, Eastleigh, Hants, Commission Agent. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Shute, Portland st, Southwark
 Burgess, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Joiner. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Davies and Hartland, Ratland st, Swansea
 Burgoynes, Maria Theresa, Lewisham, Kent, no occupation. Aug 16 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Burton, James, and James Nathaniel Leveridge, Plumstead, Kent, Engineers. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Barnfield and Sampson, Parsons' hill, Woolwich
 Carter, James Christmas, Leeds, Looking Glass Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 1 at offices of Cooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds
 Cash, George, Portsea, Hants, Iron Founder. Aug 4 at 3 at the Dolphin Hotel, Chichester. Blaize, Portsea
 Clark, David, South Hylton, Durham, Labourer. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
 Cook, William, Eston, York, Joiner. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Peacock, Zetland rd, Middlesborough
 Curtis, William Letty, Jackfield, Salop, Grocer. Aug 12 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 D'Arlene, John Baptist, Kentish town rd, Harmonium Manufacturer. July 31 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Essex st, Strand
 Date, Frederick John, Dorwas park rd, Hackney, Bottled Beer Merchant. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Tiddeman, Fishbury square
 Davison, James, Bulman Village, Northumberland, Builder. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Bird, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Dawkins, William Henry, Ilfracombe, Devon, Draper. Aug 2 at 2 at Queen's Hotel, Queen st, Exeter. Chater, Barnstaple
 Decandia, Salvatore, Cardiff, Merchant. Aug 8 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, St Mary st, Cardiff. Ingledew and Co, Cardiff
 Del, James Henry, Lower Wandsworth rd, Battersea park, Butcher. Aug 3 at 2 at offices of Layton and Co, Budge row, Cannon st
 Dougles, James Alexander, Nottingham, Provision Dealer. Aug 8 at 12, Fletcher gate, Cockayne
 Dovey, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Jeweller. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Coburn, Leadenhall st
 Downing, James, Kidderminster, Worcester, Shoe Maker. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Day and Co, Bank buildings, Kidderminster
 Dundas, Henry, Liverpool, Grocer. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Ponton, Vernon st, Liverpool
 Essery, William Aubrey, Swansea, Glamorgan, Brick Manufacturer. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Barnard and Co, Temple st, Swansea, Cos, Swansea
 Fielding, Samuel Herbert, Sheffield, Fancy Goods Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 2 at offices of Taylor, Norfolk row, Sheffield
 Franklin, Benjamin, King's rd, Chelsea, Tailor. Aug 7 at 11 at offices of Cooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds. Jones, Mark lane
 Gabbitson, John, Sheffield, Butcher. Aug 5 at 11 at offices of Legge, George, Sheffield. Eason, Sheffield
 Garner, David, Bristol, Last Maker. Aug 7 at 1 at offices of Bowman, Gresham chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol

Goodman, Harry Austin, Birmingham, Manufacturer of Leather Goods. Aug 5 at 11 at offices of Maher and Poncia, Temple st, Birmingham Green, Francis, Bradford, Lancashire, Porter. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of King, King st, Manchester Gunn, Robert, Birmingham, Hatter. Aug 9 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weeks, Temple st, Birmingham Harris, Samuel, Leigh, Lancashire, Draper. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Finney, Newlands st, Bolton Henderson, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of V.N. Dommer, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Heres, Hero, Sunderland, Durham, Ship Chandler. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland Hersey, James Thomas, Lower Swindon, Worcester, Maltster. Aug 10 at 11 at offices of Coills, Market st, Stourbridge Howell, George, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Draper. Aug 8 at 11 at the Grand Hotel, Bristol. Home, Llanelli Hughes, John, and Rowland Morgan, Mold, Flint, Tin Plate Manufacturer. Aug 2 at 3 at the King's Head Hotel, Newport. Barrell and Rodway, Liverpool, Durban, Ship Chandlers. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland Harrel, Henry, Bishop Wearmouth, Durham, Boot Maker. Aug 5 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Fawcett st, Bishop Wearmouth Smith, North Side ds Huchins, William, Neath, Glamorgan, Butcher. Aug 16 at 12 at offices of Cuthbertson and Tuberville, Water st, Neath Irvine, James, Stratford, Lancashire, Draper. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Cobett and Co. Brown st, Manchester Jackson, Charles Metcalfe, Bradford, York, Skirt Maker. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Cross and Cox, Wellington chambers, Westgate, Bradford Jackson, John Harding, Salisbury, Wiltshire, Draper. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Sturt, Ironmonger lane Jones, Richard Morwan, Trecastle, Brecon, Farmer. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Thomas, High st, brecon Jones, William, Tydlyn Phillip, Anglesey, Farmer. Aug 7 at 4 at the Victoria Hotel, Menai Bridge, Allianson, Carnarvon Joseph, John, Liverpool, Commission Agent. Aug 8 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool Martin, Liverpool Kirby, Thomas, Jno, and Joseph Chadwick, Leeds, Iron Merchants. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Walker, East Parade, Leeds Kirkbride, Joseph, Penrith, Cumberland, Woollen Draper. Aug 4 at 2.30 at offices of Arnison, St Andrew's place, Penrith Langford, William, and George Langford, Bristol, Watch Maker. Aug 8 at 1 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion Chambers, Bristol Benson and Thomas, Bristol Langier, Thomas, Ugborough, Devon, Innkeeper. Aug 9 at 2 at the Globe Hotel, Exeter Fryer, Exeter Laxton, Richard, St Paul's churchyard, Warehouseman. Aug 3 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Phelps and Sidgwick, Gresham st Lay, John Henry, Croydon, Surrey, Nurseryman. Aug 8 at 2 at offices of Young and Thompson, Great James st, Bedford row Lettinga, Noach Samuel, North Shields, Northumberland, Ship Broker. Aug 9 at 2 at offices of Von Dommer, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Millill, John, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Refreshment House Keeper. Aug 8 at 1 at the Railways Hotel, Weston-super-Mare Mason, Henry, Upper Kennington Lane, Grocer. Aug 4 at 3 at 18, Charterhouse Square, Ropkins and Co Mathias, Thomas, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Publican. Aug 3 at 12 at offices of Beddoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil Maybey, Stephen Alfred, Hornsey rd, Cheesemonger. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap McGrigge, Francis, Caerleon, Monmouth, Tin Plate Manufacturer. Aug 8 at 1.30 at the King's Head Hotel, Newport. Pain and Son, Newport Montgomery, Archibald, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Drap r. Aug 7 at 11 at offices of James, Canon st, Aberdare Moon, Joseph, South Ossett, York, General Draper. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Sykes, Oak st, Heckmondwike Morgan, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Baker. Aug 8 at 3.30 at offices of Wilcock, Queen's Chambers, North st, Wolverhampton Mortimore, Hannah, Manchester, Draper. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Farar and Hall, Irvin-ess st, Manchester Moss, Samuel Joseph, Tividhoe Colliery, Durham, Draper. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Proctor, jun, Silver st, Durham Neale, James Frederick, Norwich, Grocer. Aug 11 at 11 at offices of Winter and Francis, St Giles's st, Norwich Nicolas, Edmund, Accrington, Lancashire, General Draper. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Bellall, St James's st, Accrington Oliver, Richard, Woolwich, Kent, Fitter. Aug 15 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery Lane Owen, Robert George, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Wine Merchant. Aug 17 at 2 at offices of Taylor and Ward, Great James st, Bedford row. Moseley, Great Yarmouth Pandling, Charles, Eton, Bucks, Coal Merchant. Aug 4 at 11 at the Crown and Cushion Inn, High st, Eton Picket, Harry, Maldstone, Kent, Tailor. July 31 at 2 at offices of Arnold, Finsbury pavement Poulton, Joseph William, jun, and Montague Hayward Poulton, Fulham rd, Linen Drapers. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Miller, Moor-gate st Preece, Edward, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Wheelwright. Aug 9 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury Price, Edward, Walsall, Stafford, Brass Founder. Aug 8 at 11 at offices of Howlands, Ann st, Birmingham Radford, Henry, Worcester, Boot Maker. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Pitt, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester Ratcliffe, Henry, Market Drayton, Salop, Grocer. Aug 17 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich rd, Crewe. Pearson, Market Drayton Richards, William, Coseley, Stafford, Grocer. Aug 3 at 12 at offices of Waterhouse, Queen st, Wolverhampton Rietbold, Peter, Essex rd, Tailor. Aug 4 at 2 at offices of Sydney, Leadenhall st Row, Edwin Henry, Egg, Buckland, Devon, Gent. Aug 8 at 10.15 at offices of Curtes, St George's Hall, East Stonehouse Russell, Solomon Thomas, Camborne, Cornwall, Hair Dresser. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Daniel, Chapel st, Camborne Seabrook, George Samuel, West Green rd, Totternham, Traveller. Aug 11 at 2 at offices of Pulting and Jackson, Bishopsgate st without Shaw, Frederick, Russell rd, Kensington, no occupation. Aug 9 at 2 at the Law Institution, Chancery Lane, Barron and Co, Lincoln's Inn fields Shaw, William, Farnworth, Lancashire, Draper. Aug 9 at 3 at offices of Marlowe, Cross st, Manchester Sheppard, Henry, Blaenavon, Monmouth, Gr. cor. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Lloyd, Bank Chambers, Newport Smedley, Joseph, Sawley, Derby, Lace Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 3 at office of Flint, Full st, Derby Smith, Joseph, Bilton, Stafford, out of business. Aug 12 at 2 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton Stapleton, John Cambie, Bidston, Devon, Shoe Maker. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Rooker and Bazeley, Bingleyland st, Bidford Stewart, Robert, Swansea, Glamorgan, Draper. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of Glascoigne, Fisher st, Swansea Spencer, Dixon, Leed, Cabinet Maker. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of Rooke and Midday, White Horse, Boar Lane, Leeds Spurgin, Robert Finch, Sudbury, Suff. Ick, Beerhouse Keeper. Aug 3 at 2 at the Rose and Crown Hotel, Sudbury. Munday, Sudbury Tibury, John, Rhonddau Valley, Glamorgan, Greengrocer. Aug 8 at 3 at offices of Griffiths on Corbett, Cardiff Trebble, Edwin, Coombe Fiorey, Somer st, Timber Dealer. Aug 9 at 12 at offices of Taunton, High st, Taunton Turner, Charles, Old Lenton, Nottingham, Implement Maker. Aug 10 at 12 at the Assembly Rooms, Low Pavement, Nottingham. Waitingham Waits, Richard, Riding House st, Regent st, Tailor. Aug 9 at 1 at offices of Thompson, Gray's Inn square Watkins, James, Abergavenny, Monmouth, Builder. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Sayce, Lion st, Abergavenny Webster, Jacob, Trehetherick, Boot Maker. Aug 7 at 12.30 at the Public Hall Offices, Trehetherick, Howisia Wilkes, J. in, Newville-under-Lyme, Somer st, Timber Dealer. Aug 4 at 3 at 8, Chesapeake, Hanley. Ashmole, Hanley Williams, Henry, Hirwaun, Aberdare, Builder. Aug 7 at 1 at offices of James, Canon st, Aberdare Williams, Henry Ernest, Manchester, Skirt Manufacturer. Aug 8 at 11.30 at offices of Nuttall and Son, John Dalton st, Manchester Wilson, Thomas, Great Ayton, York, Butcher. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Gibson and Wilkinson, Atherton Chambers, Middlesborough Wilson, William, Woolwich, Kent, Picture Frame Maker. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery Lane Winfield, Samuel, Leeds, Painter. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of Harle, Bank st, Lee is Wood, John William, Cheadle, Cheshire, Coal Merchant. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Edwards, Brazenose st, Manchester

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, FLEET STREET, near TEMPLE BAR.

The Recommendations laid down by the Officials of the Board of Trade (July, 1874) had all been anticipated in their strictest form in the principles adopted at the last Bonus Investigation (December, 1871) of this Society. Thus—

1. The "Seventeen Offices" Table of Mortality was employed throughout;
2. The future rate of Interest obtainable was estimated at 3 per cent. only;
3. The whole "Loading" was reserved for future Expenses and Profits. (See Government Schedule.)

The resulting Reserves yielded the highest known protection to Policies.

The Bonus was the largest yet declared.

Nine-tenths of the Profits belong to the Assured.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

The next Bonus will be declared to 31st Dec., 1876.

E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

In the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division.—In the Matter of the Estate of Thomas Sheppard, Deceased.—“Harvey v. Harvey.”—Wills, between Salisbury and Devizes.

MR. EDMUND ROBINS (of 5, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, London) will SELL, by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, Lothbury, by the Bank of England, on THURSDAY, the 17th day of AUGUST, 1878, at TWO o'clock precisely, in pursuance of a judgment of the Court made in the above action, with the approbation of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall, valuable FREEHOLD FARMS, in Two Lots, as follows:—

Lot 1. A FREEHOLD FARM, situate in the parish of Shrewsbury, twelve miles from Salisbury, and about seven miles from the Winsford Station, on the Great Western Railway (Salisbury Line), comprising a residence with accommodation suited for a gentleman's family, surrounded by a small park, garden, stabling, and other appurtenances in perfect keeping, two entrance lodges, six cottages, and about 791 acres of arable and pasture lands in a good coursing country, abounding in game; the South Wolds and Tedworth Hounds hunt the district; the whole is in the occupation of J. Nichols, Esq., a tenant of 30 years' standing, under a lease at a rent of £737 per annum. Possession can be arranged, if desired, with the lessee, who contemplates relinquishing farming. This estate is admirably adapted to a gentleman wishing to combine agricultural pursuits with field sports.

Lot 2. At SUTTON VENY, about 3½ miles from Warminster and 1½ miles from Hockleybury Station, on the Great Western Railway (Salisbury Line), a capital Freehold Farm, free from tithe or land tax, comprising good comfortable family residence, with park-like meadow land in front, all necessary buildings and cottages, and 841 acres 2 rods 32 poles of arable, pasture, and down land of which about 18 acres are very valuable water meadows. In the occupation of Mr. George Collins, holding under a lease expiring at Michaelmas next at a rent of £570 per annum.

Particulars and plans may be had at the respective farms; at the chief hotels in Salisbury, Warminster, and Devizes; or

Messrs. BOOTYS & BAYLIFFE, Solicitors, 1, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn, W.C.;

Messrs. BAXTERS & CO., Solicitors, Nos. 5 and 6, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W.;

RICHARD SMITH, Esq., Solicitor, 7, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.;

Messrs. DAWES & SONS, Solicitors, No. 9, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street, E.C.;

Messrs. ROBINSON & PRESTON, Solicitors, 35, Lincoln's-fields, W.C.;

Messrs. CHURCH, SONS, & CLARKE, Solicitors, 9, Bedford-row, W.C.;

Messrs. MACKESON, TAYLOR, & ARNOULD, Solicitors, 59, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.;

at the Auction Mart; and of Mr. ROBINS, Auctioneer and Surveyor, 5, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, S.W.

(Signed) ROBERT W. PEAKE, Chief Clerk.

In the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division.—In the Matter of the Estate of Thomas Sheppard, deceased.—“Harvey v. Harvey.”—Sussex, between Lewes and Eastbourne, and within a short distance of Peugate Junction, on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.

MR. EDMUND ROBINS (of 5, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, London) will SELL, by AUCTION, at the MART, in Tokenhouse-yard, Lothbury, by the Bank of England, on THURSDAY, the 17th day of AUGUST, 1878, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Four Lots, in pursuance of a judgment of the Court made in the above action, with the approbation of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall, an important FREEHOLD DOMAIN, as follows:—

Lot 1. An ANCIENT FREEHOLD MANORIAL ESTATE, known as Folkington-place, about 1,600 acres in extent, beautifully situate under the Southdown Hills. On the property is a mansion erected in the year 1843, in the most substantial manner in the Tudor style. The accommodation consists of a suite of reception-rooms, noble oaken staircase, and entrance-hall, 15 best and secondary bed-chambers, ample domestic offices, pleasure, ornamental grounds, spacious walled kitchen garden, stabling for seven horses, farmery and several inclosures of beautifully-timbered, park-like meadow land, pheasantry, kennels, gardeners' and keepers' cottages, and other appurtenances. The woodlands and other lands in hand include about 265 acres of valuable coverts for game, especially the woods known as Natewood and Folkington Wood. The Eastbourne Harriers and the South Down Foxhounds hunt the district. A favorite meet of the latter is at Folkington. The lands are let on leases, and consist of the Folkington Place or Home Farm (531 acres), in the occupation of the executrix of the late Mr. Groom, and possession of this farm, as well as of the mansion and lands in hand, may be had on the completion of the purchase; the Wootton and Natewood Farms (534 acres) in the occupation of Mr. Vallance Elam; and one other small holding known as Dennis's, about 7½ acres. Each of these farms has excellent and commodious homesteads and buildings. The rent-roll, real and estimated, closely approaches £2,000 per annum. The property adjoins the estates of the Duke of Devonshire and other important owners, and is well and distinctly defined and bounded, and lies virtually within a ring fence. About 300 acres of the Home Farm are sheep run on the South Downs. At the southern extremity of the estate on the Downs is Hantors Burgh, said to be the highest point in Sussex, commanding a magnificent prospect.

Lot 2. An EXCELLENT FREEHOLD FARM, lying adjacent to Lot 1, known as the Osham Court Farm, in the parish of Hailsham, closely adjoining the Wootton Farm (part of Lot 1), consisting of a capital homestead and buildings, and 191a. 1r. 38p. of arable and pas-

ture land, in the occupation of Mrs. Waters, at a rent and other payments equivalent to £171 4s. per annum.

Lot 3. SEVERAL INCLOSURES of VALUABLE FREEHOLD MARSH LAND, in the parish of Hailsham, known as the Home Crooks, comprising about 47 acres, now let with the Folkington Place Farm. For Sale with possession.

Lot 4. SEVERAL INCLOSURES of PASTURE LAND, comprising the Manor of Willingdon, situate near the village of Lower Willingdon, comprising about 32½ acres, in the occupation of Mr. Mewton, yearly tenant, at the inadequate rent, with other payments, amounting to £56 16s. per annum. Also a Freshold Arable Field, immediately adjoining, let at an apportioned rent of £12 per annum.

The mansion may be viewed. Particulars, plans, and views may be had thereat; at the chief hotels in Lewes, Eastbourne, and Hastings, of

Mr. W. BARBER, Land Agent, Willingdon, Hawkhurst; of Messrs. BOOTYS & BAYLIFFE, Solicitors, 1, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn, W.C.;

Messrs. BAXTERS & CO., Solicitors, 5 and 6, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W.;

RICHARD SMITH, Esq., Solicitor, 7, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.;

Messrs. DAWES & SON, Solicitors, 9, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street, E.C.;

Messrs. ROBINSON & PRESTON, Solicitors, 35, Lincoln's-fields, W.C.;

Messrs. CHURCH, SONS, & CLARKE, Solicitors, 9, Bedford-row, W.C.;

Messrs. MACKESON, TAYLOR, & ARNOULD, Solicitors, 59, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.;

at the Auction Mart; and of Mr. ROBINS, Auctioneer and Surveyor, 5, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, S.W.

(Signed) ROBERT W. PEAKE, Chief Clerk.

CITY OF LONDON.
Valuable Freehold Property.

MR. W. PARRELL is instructed to SELL, by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1878, at ONE for TWO o'clock, the important and valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY, most sub-tantially erected and eligibly situate, known as 129 and 128½, Lower Thames-street, and King William-street, in the City of London, let at very low rents, but estimated to produce at the end of the present term (1881) an annual income of at least £725.

On view by permission of the tenants, and particulars had at Mart; of

T. BERKELEY, Esq., Solicitor, 12, Gray's-inn-square; and of the Auctioneer, 2, Gresham-buildings, Basinghall-street, E.C.

CITY OF LONDON.

Important Leasehold Investment.—A very valuable Property, comprising two extensive blocks of modern buildings, situate within a few yards only of the Mansion House, and estimated to produce when fully occupied, a rental of over £7,500 per annum.—By order of the Proprietor.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, at TWO o'clock precisely, the highly valuable LEASEHOLD PROPERTY, known as No. 1 Queen's-buildings, Queen Victoria-street, comprising two commanding and very substantial blocks of modern shops, offices, and premises, extending from Queen Victoria-street to Pancras-lane, with a frontage of 47 feet to the former and 52 feet to the latter, the total ground being about 4,500 square feet. The premises consist of eight floors (including basement and sub-basement); the noble range having bold elevation in Portland stone. Both buildings are arranged in numerous suites of first-class offices, &c., with two candle-shops fronting Queen Victoria-street, a patent steam passage lift from the lower basement to all the floors, and every modern convenience. The whole is estimated to realize, when fully occupied, a gross rental of upwards of £7,500 a year, of which nearly £4,000 per annum are already secured, from responsible tenants, by leases or agreements. The property will be sold subject to a lease for about 76 years unexpired, at a ground rent which is moderate in comparison with those payable in respect of other buildings in the immediate vicinity. As the excellency of the position and superior accommodation afforded by these premises must in due course insure a letting of the entirety, the property would form a very eligible purchase for an investment society or for a private capitalist.

Particulars, with plans, &c., of

Messrs. POOLE & HUGHES, Solicitors, 33, Chancery-lane; and of the Auctioneers, No. 80, Cheapside.

Postponed from Tuesday, July 18, until Thursday, August 3.—Sale—Reversion amounting to £23,500 (in One Lot).

MESSRS. FULLER & FULLER will SELL, by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, City, on THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, at TWO precisely, in One Lot, the Absolute Reversion to one-half of £7,000, and the benefit of survivorship to the sum of £20,000, both being receivable on the decease of a lady aged 57.

Particulars and conditions of sale may be obtained of

Messrs. BRADFORD & CO., Solicitors, Langbourn-chamber, Fenchurch-street, E.C.;

and of Messrs. FULLER & FULLER, Auctioneers, Land Agents, Valuers, 26, Bucksbury, London, E.C.

